

Whether another attempt to enact a similar bill is made may depend on the congressional elections this fall.

William Kuhfuss, president of the Illinois Agricultural Association, has made it clear to farmers in his State what needs to be done.

"We feel we need to support those Congressmen who paid heed to the letters and telegrams from Farm Bureau members and voted in support of the Farm Bureau position," he said.

The rollcall votes on the farm bill in the Senate and House are printed and each Member is recorded. Congress-

man DENT, of Pennsylvania, was one of those who supported his farmers.

Your Congressmen have voted. It is your turn to vote in November. Your vote may help determine whether this was the crucial year in the continuing fight for the American farm family's freedom.

## SENATE

MONDAY, OCTOBER 8, 1962

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, Thou hast set us in a world of wonder and beauty. Every new day we turn to Thee, seeking deliverance from low motivation which would crucify wonder and beauty on a cross of personal greed or gain.

Give us to see and to feel that our highest job in these fleeting days of mortal life is found in the loveliness of nature, in the lure of friendship, in the conquest of difficulty, and in the compensations of selfless service. In the preoccupation of this world capital, with vast issues that in their implications belt the earth, forgive us for our tendency to see too readily human failings in those close to us, and for our slowness in being aware of the virtues of those who toil by our side.

In this day of destiny, when in the fires of revolution all humanity seems molten, ready to be poured into new channels, may we be carried up into Thy great purposes for Thy human family, and find in Thee, Father of mankind, above our human contentions, the goal of all our striving and the end of all our desiring, as we pray, "Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done." We ask it in the name of the Holy One who taught us thus to pray. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, October 5, 1962, was dispensed with.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on October 5, 1962, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 699) to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Hungarian Reformed Federation of America," approved March 2, 1907, and for other purposes.

### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States, submitting

sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 2450. An act for the relief of Maj. C. Todd, Jr., and the estate of Ira T. Todd, Sr.;

S. 2451. An act for the relief of G. W. Todd and the estate of Lloyd Parks;

S. 2953. An act relating to the tax-exempt status of the pension plan of Local Union No. 435 of the International Hod Carriers' Building and Common Laborers' Union of America; and

S. 3394. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. William A. Carter, U.S. Air Force.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1447) to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended, and to provide for the adjustment of annuities paid from the District of Columbia teachers' retirement and annuity fund, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 3705) to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended, to increase salaries, to adjust pay alignment, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 3361) to facilitate the entry of alien skilled specialists and certain relatives of U.S. citizens, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes by the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. WALTER, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. CHELF, Mr. POFF, and Mr. MOORE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13175) making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 19, 23, and 26 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 18, 20, 22, and 24 to the bill, and concurred therein, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 8853) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to include Maine among the States which may obtain social security coverage, under State agreement, for State and local policemen and firemen, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 570. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the situation in Berlin; and

H. Con. Res. 583. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of 185,000 copies of the Constitution of the United States and the amendments thereto.

### ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 914. An act to provide for more effective administration of public assistance in the District of Columbia, to make certain relatives responsible for support of needy persons, and for other purposes;

S. 1288. An act to amend section 362(b) of the Communications Act of 1934;

S. 1552. An act to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to assure the safety, effectiveness, and reliability of drugs, authorize standardization of drug names, and clarify and strengthen existing inspection authority; and for other purposes;

S. 1563. An act to authorize the conveyance of certain lands within the Clark Hill Reservoir, Savannah River, Ga.-S.C., to the Georgia-Carolina Council, Inc., Boy Scouts of America, for recreation and camping purposes;

S. 1658. An act to amend the act of January 2, 1951, prohibiting the transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce;

S. 2454. An act to amend the Housing Amendments of 1955 to make Indian tribes eligible for Federal loans to finance public works or facilities, and for other purposes;

S. 2928. An act for the relief of Seymour K. Owens;

S. 3631. An act to amend title 13, United States Code, to preserve the confidential nature of copies of reports filed with the Bureau of the Census on a confidential basis;

S. 3679. An act authorizing an appropriation to enable the United States to extend an invitation to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations to hold a World Food Congress in the United States in 1963;

H.R. 7927. An act to adjust postal rates, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 235. Joint resolution to extend the time during which loans for mass transportation facilities may be made under title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955.

## HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 8853) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to include Maine among the States which may obtain social security coverage, under State agreement, for State and local policemen and firemen, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

## HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 570) expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the situation in Berlin, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the primary purpose of the United States in its relations with all other nations is and has been to develop and sustain a just and enduring peace for all; and

Whereas it is the purpose of the United States to encourage and support the establishment of a free, unified, and democratic Germany; and

Whereas in connection with the termination of hostilities in World War II of the United States, the United Kingdom, France, and the Soviet Union freely entered into binding agreements under which the four powers have the right to remain in Berlin, with the right of ingress and egress, until the conclusion of a final settlement with the Government of Germany; and

Whereas no such final settlement has been concluded by the four powers and the aforementioned agreements continue in force: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress—*

(a) that the continued exercise of United States, British, and French rights in Berlin constitutes a fundamental political and moral determination;

(b) that the United States would regard as intolerable any violation by the Soviet Union directly or through others of those rights in Berlin, including the right of ingress and egress;

(c) that the United States is determined to prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms, any violation of those rights by the Soviet Union directly or through others, and to fulfill our commitment to the people of Berlin with respect to their resolve for freedom.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 583) to provide for the printing of 185,000 copies of the Constitution of the United States and the amendments thereto, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, one hundred and eighty-five thousand copies of the Constitution of the United States and the amendments thereto, suitable for distribution as provided for by section 8 of the Act approved July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 508; Public Law 86-650), as amended by S.J. Res. 60, to immigrants admitted for permanent residence.*

## LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

## SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 2285)

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I note that the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is in the Chamber, as is my colleague the distinguished junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS].

In pursuance of my statement to them on last Friday, I send to the desk at this time the report from the Senate Appropriations Committee on House bill 13290, which is the last supplemental appropriation bill for this session and the first supplemental appropriation bill for 1963. I ask that the report be filed at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

The bill (H.R. 13290) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, was placed on the calendar.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the action taken by my distinguished colleague is in complete conformity with his statement of the other day.

However, it now becomes timely for me, in pursuance of the objectives I am trying to achieve, to propound a parliamentary inquiry and then to make a statement.

Mr. President, I now desire to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida will state it.

Mr. SMATHERS. If I were to ask that the Senate observe the rule that appropriation bills lie on the table for 3 days, such a request would now be in order, would it not?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes, and then the bill would be placed on the calendar.

Mr. SMATHERS. And if I asked that the rule be observed and that the appropriation bill lie on the table for 3 days, when would it then be possible for the bill to be considered?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On Friday.

Mr. SMATHERS. On Friday?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I should like to say to the leadership that I would now like to give official notice—and I should like to have the leader understand that I am doing it—that I wish to have the rule followed—namely, to have this supplemental appropriation bill lie over, in accordance with the rule, for the necessary 3 days.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senator will be acting within his rights if he exerts those rights to the limit. It will mean, if the supplemental appropriation bill is reported today, that the Senate will not reach it until Thursday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Friday.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I understand—and I hope the Chair will correct me—that if it is reported, and if the rule is car-

ried to its full effect, it can not be considered until Friday, instead of Thursday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President.

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, in case my good friend the distinguished Senator from Florida should relent in his determination, I desire to enter an objection. Should the Senator withdraw his objection, I desire to enter an objection. After the morning hour is concluded and I can obtain recognition, I wish to discuss briefly some of the misstatements and falsehoods which have been made with respect to the position of the Senate on the agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in view of what has been said today, I think the Senate is on notice, and I hope all plans Senators have made will be canceled. As far as I am concerned, I am reconciled to remaining here for a long time.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President—

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I believe I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). The Senator from Florida has the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. I respect the rights of my distinguished friends and colleagues in taking the position which they have taken. Inasmuch as I expect to observe the rules, I shall not attempt to call up the bill prior to the expiration of 3 days without first consulting the distinguished Senator from Georgia and my distinguished colleague from Florida. I hope events will be such that they can relent, because I had expected to attend my annual homecoming party, if I may call it that, which is set for Friday. It has been set for several months. I thought, by setting it for that day, it would be possible for us to have a 2-week vacation in the delightful mountains of North Carolina, giving us a day or two before we reached home. I hope the Senate may consider this important measure in time for me to fulfill that engagement, because, if it does not, I shall either have to turn over my responsibility to another Senator or ask that the Senate meet next Monday.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. I share the hope of my colleague. I hope events will be such that the matter will not have to go over until Friday.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I share that hope, but I shall be glad to support the Senator, if he does not get unanimous consent, in a motion to postpone consideration of the bill until Monday if we do not get the action desired.

Mr. HOLLAND. While that would be cruel and inhuman punishment, as described in the Constitution, for all Senators, including the three of us now



discussing this question, I would be perfectly willing to accede to that suggestion if it became necessary. I do not think we can lose sight of the fact that the two Senators who have been engaged in the colloquy are engaged in trying to obtain important objectives, important to the Senate and to Members of Congress on both sides of the Capitol.

I yield the floor.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I am not wholly unaware of what the rules of the Senate provide, and therefore I can understand, by the comments made a few moments ago by some of our colleagues, that this session of the Congress may continue for another week or possibly longer. There is very little anyone can do about it, except what many have already done, and that is to play some hooky.

The first Tuesday after the first Monday in November will occur 4 weeks from tomorrow when, under the Constitution, the people of the United States will be called upon to register their sentiments with respect to all the Members in the House of Representatives, and somewhat in excess of one-third of the Members of the U.S. Senate. There are some Democrats in this Chamber and some Republicans who have a very keen interest in the outcome of that election.

I view with deep regret—may I say with bitter regret—the fact that we are chained to Washington and to this Chamber in what has been the longest, and most enervating session in my 10 years' service in this body.

I speak as one who supported H.R. 10 on two or three occasions since 1953. I wish the President of the United States had seen fit, before today, to approve or reject H.R. 10 and send it back here if he rejected it, so that the Congress could then also make its decision in accordance with the constitutional process in the event the President saw fit to veto it.

I rise mainly because of the feeling of exasperation and frustration that I believe is shared by every one of my colleagues.

#### REPORT ENTITLED "IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CARGO PREFERENCE LAWS BY THE ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 2286)

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President on behalf of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], chairman of the Committee on Commerce, I submit a report covering activities of the committee during the current Congress for the purpose of strengthening the administration of the cargo preference statute and related laws.

Cargo preference, sometimes known as fifty-fifty, is a national policy established permanently in Public Law 664 of the 83d Congress, which provides that at least 50 percent of all Government-financed and Government-aid ocean cargoes shall be transported in commercial vessels of U.S. registry.

From the very beginning, administration of this policy by some departments and agencies has been the occasion of controversy. Although the 50 percent reservation of such cargoes was intended by Congress to be a minimum, it has apparently been considered as a maximum at times by administering departments. Also, there have been a number of occasions where purchases for Government account, particularly intended for use abroad, while clearly covered by statute, have been exempted by departmental decree from the cargo preference requirements.

During this Congress Senator MAGNUSON has taken up with various departments and agencies specific cases where cargo preference was intended to apply, and has been instrumental in securing compliance with the spirit as well as the wording of the statutes.

The report cites some of these instances, and includes also the directive issued by the President to the executive departments and agencies, setting forth the requirements for maximum use of U.S.-flag vessels for transportation of Government-generated cargoes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 3798. A bill for the relief of Benedetto Barretta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 3799. A bill to establish an interdepartmental committee to promote economy and efficiency in the conduct of educational and cultural exchange programs; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. MUNDT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

#### INTERDEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE TO PROMOTE ECONOMY AND EFFICIENCY IN CONDUCT OF EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE PROGRAMS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I introduce a bill for the purpose of establishing an interdepartmental committee to promote economy and efficiency in the conduct of educational and cultural exchange programs, and ask unanimous consent that it be referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3799) to establish an interdepartmental committee to promote economy and efficiency in the conduct of educational and cultural exchange programs, introduced by Mr. MUNDT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, by way of explanation, I would like to review for the Senate the activities and pro-

ceedings surrounding one of the important information and cultural exchange programs which took place in my home State, at the South Dakota State Agriculture College, in Brookings, S. Dak., during the past summer.

Through the cooperation of the Foreign Agriculture Training Division, the Agency for International Development, and the Cultural Exchange Division of the Department of State, arrangements were made to invite technicians, students, and Government officials to an international soil and water utilization seminar. The seminar was successfully conducted by the staff at South Dakota State College. Sixty-two nationals from thirty-one countries participated in this first seminar.

However, during the planning process and during the seminar itself, we observed that there are some deficiencies in the operation of the exchange programs, and it is for this purpose that we hope a study can be made for streamlining some of them.

The seminar which we undertook was not one which was planned well in advance. The entire operation was well under a year. It was not something for which appropriations had been specifically made. The funding was done by various agencies. It was not something specifically spelled out in law. It was achieved through the most heartwarming cooperation of dedicated public servants, working within the framework of existing laws.

We hope that this is but the first of such seminars, but we recognize that there will have to be some changes made either in law or Executive orders so the subsequent seminars can reach fruition.

The ideas surrounding the need for this legislation are not mine alone. I have spoken of "we" during these remarks because what I am saying reflects the views of many who work in the exchange-of-persons programs.

I firmly believe in the value of exchanging information and ideas, and I have supported legislation to establish them. However, when we have programs of this kind, scattered through many departments, and through agencies in the departments, we are likely to find that the programs get a little out of hand with duplication of effort and lack of coordination on programing. This has happened on some of our exchange programs. Those of us interested in these exchange efforts believe that there is a possibility that these programs can be operated in a more coordinated manner, that we can carry them out more efficiently, and that we can, thereby, promote economy.

I realize that it is late in the session to be introducing such a bill, but I do it for the reason that it will give executive agencies a little time to look at the bill and to do some thinking and planning. I fully intend to reintroduce the bill at the beginning of the next session of Congress, but we will have a short time between the end of this session and the beginning of the next when executive personnel can have an opportunity

to summarize their thoughts in preparation for hearings, which I hope we can hold shortly after the first of the year.

#### NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF CARL E. MCGOWAN TO BE U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Monday, October 15, 1962, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Carl E. McGowan, of Illinois, to be U.S. circuit judge for the District of Columbia circuit, vice Henry W. Edgerton, retiring.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], chairman, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and myself.

#### ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Proclamation by the President of the United States of America for National Employment the Physically Handicapped Week, 1962.

Joint statement by the associate members of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

Article entitled "Jobs for the Disabled," by Howard A. Rusk, M.D., appearing in the New York Times of Sunday, October 7, 1962.

#### NEWS STORIES WRITTEN BY STUDENTS OF APGAR-WEST GLACIER SCHOOL, MONT.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, at a time when we are being subjected to an avalanche of end-of-the-session amendments, statistics, conference reports, and other assorted heavy reading, it is refreshing to have news of the lighter side of life cross our desks.

Such was the case the other day when Mel Ruder, editor of the Hungry Horse News, of Columbia Falls, Mont., sent me a column of news stories written by boys and girls of the Apgar-West Glacier School. I found them very entertaining, and I think the youngsters should be complimented for their fine job of writing.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEE DEER

Today when David Randy and I went home at noon we saw a doe and fawn. We stayed and watched. After a while we saw the doe

jump a bush, then it ran away.—BOBBY SHELLEY.

My mother and I went to Great Falls to visit my father over the weekend. We drove to Belt and saw some old gold mines and a silver mine. We took pictures of the silver. I found a rock with silver in it. After that we went to see Charlie Russell's studio to add a picture of it to our school collection and when we were coming home we stopped at the Goat Lick and saw a great big goat slide down by the salt lick. When I was coming home from Sunday school last Sunday, I saw a Canada jay. Now the birds are coming back. We had stellar jays at our window.—BILLY TROTTER.

Saturday my grandmother went to let her cats in and a bear was on the porch. My grandmother put her head out and the bear slapped her. She had to go to the doctor. We live at Nyack.—PATTY SHOWN.

Friday afternoon the Bookmobile came. We all enjoy the Bookmobile. We like the books very much. David Shaver is the librarian this time. His assistants are Judy Sloan and Donita Tyree.—CARY KING.

#### SMELLS BETTER NOW

There was a skunk visiting our house last Friday. He sprayed our dog, Rebel, a little. Rebel is a great big white dog with a pink nose and two brown eyes. We all like him. He is getting to smell better now.—KAREN BENGSTON.

There are two or three bears in the Nyack Valley. They come down every night and tip over garbage cans. There is one with paint on its head. The bear by our house just tips it over and doesn't scatter the garbage. We hope it isn't a grizzly bear. When they have paint on them that means that the park has caught them and have taken them away when one of these have paint on it.—TOMMY SANDS.

One day when we were eating, we heard a squeaking noise. Grandpa went out to see what was the matter. There was a chipmunk down in our empty window box and it couldn't get out. Grandpa went and got my butterfly net, and took the chipmunk out. He knocked on the window and we looked. He showed us the chipmunk and then he let him go.—RANDY COOK.

I was tying my shoe and I put my little chain bracelet in my mouth. When I raised my head I forgot about it and swallowed it.—CHELI TESMER.

#### TIGHT MONEY HAS SLOWED ECONOMY, CREATED UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the traditional method used for many years by our Government to stimulate the economy has been the adjustment of our money supply—to increase or to decrease interest rates. This is a method which virtually everyone, of every political party—Democrats, Republicans, and independents—approves. It is traditional. It is accepted. Unfortunately, during the past several years our monetary policy has been to keep interest rates artificially high, in my opinion.

The fact is that the money supply has been lower; that is tighter, in relationship to the gross national product, than it has been at any other time in the last 35 years, tighter than when Andrew Mellon was Secretary of the Treasury. This is one of the principal reasons why the economy has not moved ahead as rapidly as it should. This is a major reason for large and continuing unemployment.

George W. Mitchell is the only Kennedy appointee to the Federal Reserve Board. He is an eminent banker—and, incidentally, a native of Wisconsin. He has served for many years as a top official in the Federal Reserve System. In the October issue of the Mortgage Banker, he has written an article answering the question, "Could monetary policy in the last 6 months have made a greater contribution to our overall economic well-being?"

His answer is as follows—and I quote the concluding paragraph of the article:

We come down to the basic question of the past 6 months, "Could monetary policy have made a greater contribution to our overall economic well-being?" The slower expansion thus far in 1962 suggests that a more aggressive monetary policy involving greater credit availability might have led to a fuller utilization of resources. The concern with the level of short-term rates has been a key factor in inhibiting policy. Against the possibility of more rapid economic growth we have had to balance the risk that reduced interest rates and greater liquidity might have worsened our balance of payments further.

Mr. President, I feel very strongly—and the case is overwhelming—that interest rate differentials affect only very slightly our balance of payments. The studies by Dr. Phillip Bell, of Haverford College; Robert Roosa, of the Treasury; and Robert F. Gemmill, of the Federal Reserve Board, show that this is so. I hope that before radical fiscal measures—unbalancing the budget by drastically cutting taxes at a time when revenues are already too small to permit balancing the budget—will not be used until we have a real opportunity to use monetary policy far more aggressively to move the economy ahead.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Mitchell be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### COULD MONETARY POLICY IN THE PAST 6 MONTHS HAVE MADE A GREATER CONTRIBUTION TO OUR OVERALL ECONOMIC WELL-BEING?

(By George W. Mitchell)

Our current economic situation is notable for the absence so far of upward price pressures. So far as average prices are concerned, this is explained in part by the level of unutilized resources and by a number of comparatively noninflationary wage settlements.

So far as sensitive industrial prices are concerned, it may be explained more by moderate demand for basic materials relative to the domestic and worldwide capacity to provide them.

All in all, then, in the first half of 1962, spending, particularly for durable goods and inventories, slowed down. In relation to their incomes, both consumers and businesses spent less for final goods and services in the first half of 1962 than they had after a comparable period of time in the upswing following the cyclical trough of early 1958. With consumer spending not very high relative to income and with the internal flow of business funds from retained earnings and depreciation larger than capital outlays, there have not been heavy demand pressures on credit markets and the supply of funds to markets has remained fairly large.



What then can be said about the basic cause of this slowdown? Does it reflect fundamental shifts in the structure of the economy, or is it the same kind of cyclical phenomenon we have often experienced in the past?

In the past year or more, the public seems to have been quite willing to save. This could be the result of many influences, including diminished inflationary expectations. Saving is the source of funds to finance investment demand of business and consumers, but if investment demand is lagging, then the saving acts as a brake on economic growth.

It now appears that as the post-World War II experience recedes further into the past, we can count less and less on the willingness of the American consumer to go heavily into debt in order to acquire durable goods. Needs are less urgent and tastes are turning more toward services and types of expenditures less likely to be financed by borrowing.

At the same time, the Federal budget moves rapidly, sometimes too rapidly, from deficit toward surplus in economic recovery. At such times enlarged Government saving supplements private saving. This places a heavy burden on rising investment outlays by business and consumers to maintain the momentum of economic expansion. To deal with structural problems such as these, monetary policy needs to be complemented by other governmental economic action.

For several years now, foreign countries have been adding to gold and dollar holdings because they have been running a surplus in their balance of payments with the United States. Our trade balance has generally been favorable, but this has often been offset by aid and military expenditures abroad, by other current account payments for service, and by long-term capital outflows, in large part representing direct investments in overseas branches and subsidiaries. Taking all these elements together, then, we can see that what may be called our basic balance has been generally unfavorable in recent years.

In 1960 and 1961, this situation was intensified by large short-term capital outflows from this country, partly because interest rates were high abroad and relatively low here, partly because of the demand for bank credit by certain foreign borrowers, and partly at times because of speculative activity in exchange markets. Such outflows have been less of a problem so far in 1962, however.

The balance-of-payments position has influenced credit market developments because monetary and fiscal authorities have attempted to minimize incentives for capital to flow abroad, particularly highly volatile liquid funds. It has had an influence primarily on short-term interest rates and, to some degree, on the availability of credit at commercial banks. Thus, financial market developments have been influenced not only by trends in domestic economic activity but also by balance-of-payments developments and by the reaction of policy authorities to such developments.

The continued high level of saving by consumers and business has been accompanied by a shift in the supply of funds more toward the long end of the credit market. The supply of funds channeled to this sector of the market by commercial banks and non-bank financial institutions expanded during the first 6 months of 1962. This was partly a result of shifts in the structure of institutional liabilities, especially in the first quarter of the year, when the public channeled unusually large amounts of funds into time and savings deposits at commercial banks. Consider some of these changes that occurred in supply conditions:

Bank reserve positions: Reserves available to banks provide a basis for bank credit expansion and, therefore, an important influence on the supply of funds in markets. The

reserve position of banks has continued to be comparatively favorable so far in 1962, although growth in their total reserves has been slower than last year. Member bank borrowings from Federal Reserve banks have generally continued to be minimal. And free reserves of banks—that is, excess reserves less borrowings—have varied between \$350 and \$550 million for the past 6 months. In earlier expansionary periods, such as 1958–59, banks had already increased their borrowings markedly by this point, and they had shifted to a net borrowed reserve position. The maintenance of a free reserve position for so long a period is primarily the result of moderate bank loan demand, and the consequent willingness of the Federal Reserve to supply reserves in step with total bank deposit expansion.

Excess reserves are held mainly by country banks and in the past decade have varied within fairly narrow range. In late 1960, banks were permitted to count all their vault cash as part of required reserves. For a few months around that time, excess reserves were above normal levels, but they soon returned to around earlier levels as bankers became accustomed to the new regulation and adapted their investment policies to take it into account.

Borrowings at Federal Reserve banks are the volatile element affecting free reserves, and city banks are the most active borrowers. Their borrowings are influenced by the vigor of loan demands and the relative level of the discount rate. The discount rate is ordinarily kept in fairly close alignment with related market rates, but for the past 2 years or so it has remained unchanged at the 3 percent level to which it had been reduced in the summer of 1960 and has been consistently above market rates. At the same time private loan demand has been moderate. Thus, banks have had little incentive to borrow at Federal Reserve banks even at the present stage of the business upturn.

For most of the past 2 years, banks have been able to obtain temporary reserve funds, when needed, at rates generally below the discount rate by borrowing excess balances of other banks in what is called the Federal funds market, a market that has become increasingly more active in the past 3 years.

Money supply, bank deposits, and related assets: In the past year and a half, an unusually large proportion of funds flowing into commercial banks from the public took the form of time and savings deposits. Such deposits expanded by 13 percent in 1961, quite a high rate. In the first quarter of 1962 the annual rate of increase accelerated to 25 percent, but it has since returned to the 1961 rate.

Given the amount of reserves made available to banks by the monetary authorities, the large increases in time and savings deposits adversely influenced the growth in money supply—that is, currency and demand deposits held by the public. In the first 3 months of 1962, money supply declined slightly from its year-end level. Partly there were switches directly from demand to time accounts. And partly there were switches from market instruments and other assets to time deposits.

From the statistical evidence it does not appear that much of the rise in time and savings deposits in 1962 represented funds diverted from other savings institutions. Net inflows of funds to mutual savings banks rose in the first quarter of 1962, after allowance for seasonal variation, and remained above their 1961 pace of increase in the second quarter.

Net inflows to savings and loan associations in the first quarter were about the same as their high fourth quarter of 1961 rate, but these inflows fell off in the second quarter, paralleling reduced inflows to commercial banks. But some of the expansion

in bank credit appears to have represented a diversion of savings from direct purchases of market instruments, or to a small extent from flows that might otherwise have gone to other nonbank financial institutions, and has, therefore, not represented a net increase in total credit.

Money supply in the hands of the public is about at the average level reached in December 1961. Contributing to the sluggishness of money supply was the large buildup in U.S. Government deposits until early July, when they were run down to some extent. Though, in fact, Government deposits were rising the Treasury continued security offerings, including a large amount of bills, in anticipation of a rise in Government spending relative to current tax receipts. Most of these short-term issues may well have been purchased by the nonbank public, who in some degree may have reduced idle cash holdings to do so or who may have used cash that might otherwise have financed spending. The public has in effect substituted short-term U.S. Government securities for cash, and they can hold these securities at interest rates that are attractive in periods of economic uncertainty.

Turnover of money: While the money supply has shown little increase, it has been used more intensively to finance the economy's spending, but not intensively enough to accommodate the higher level of spending hoped for. The turnover of demand deposits outside of New York—in New York turnover is more heavily influenced by financial transactions—was higher in the first half of 1962 than in the second half of 1961. A large part of the increase occurred early in the year, and was possibly related to the sharp initial movements of funds into time and savings deposits. But turnover did rise further in the second quarter, when inflows to time and savings accounts slowed down.

Turnover has generally risen throughout the postwar period from low levels reached during the 1930's depression and the war years, when the public was keeping itself in a highly liquid state—in one period voluntarily and the other involuntarily. But it has also shown cyclical variation. After adjusting for seasonal variation and for the general trend, deposit turnover has generally declined in recessions and risen in expansions. In New York, however, turnover has often risen in recession and declined in expansion. During the last recession, turnover in centers outside New York did not show as much cyclical decline as in the 1957–58 recession, possibly because of greater public preference for other assets. It is significant that short-term interest rates declined less in the last recession than in 1957–58.

Whether or not cyclically rising turnover can substitute for growth in the money supply is an important question. Many analysts have contended that turnover has a ceiling and much discussion focuses on whether or not it has been reached or approached. If it were reached, lack of money supply growth would mean lack of economic growth, for at that point the public would be unwilling to economize further on the use of cash balances in order to increase spending.

The trouble with this approach is that it looks only at the observed rate of turnover but fails to measure the strain imposed on the economy by the very act of increasing turnover. At any given time the economy can adapt to a smaller relative money supply and this will show up as increased velocity. The important question is, does the adaption involve less spending than would otherwise have occurred. One example would be that the inducement to economize cash balances is a high level of short-term interest rates, so high as to place a floor under long-term rates, which in turn inhibits borrowing to finance capital outlays.

**Bank credit:** With the rapid expansion of time and savings deposits total commercial bank credit outstanding has grown fairly rapidly so far in 1962, although there were slack periods in the early spring and early summer. Of total funds raised in credit markets, almost one-third were advanced by the commercial banking system in 1961 and also the first half of 1962. This was a larger proportion than in 4 preceding years, except for 1958—years when the supply of reserve funds was under more restraint.

In managing their loan and investment portfolios, banks this year invested heavily in tax-exempt State and local government issues and also became more interested in longer term loans such as mortgages. During the recession and early in the recovery, they invested heavily in U.S. Government securities, particularly short-term issues. Since mid-1961, however, U.S. Government security holdings have not increased very much.

So far in 1962, banks have put more emphasis on longer term than on short-term U.S. Government securities. They have reduced their holdings of Treasury bills, and have added to holdings of longer term Treasury issues, in part by participating in new financings. Holdings of all U.S. Government securities maturing within a year increased slightly, however, during the first half of 1962, because of the effect that passage of time has on securities remaining in bank portfolios.

These changes in bank investment behavior have several causes. Incentive to invest heavily in the longer term sectors of the market was provided by the large increase in time and savings deposits that occurred after the first of the year, when maximum permissible interest rates were raised on those deposits. At this point, banks began more actively to seek higher earning assets at some sacrifice perhaps in already high liquidity. Banks had built up their liquidity to rather high levels by mid-1961, through adding to short-term U.S. Government securities at the comparatively favorable short-term rates that prevailed for a period of recession and early recovery. Thus, they were not necessarily eager to add further to liquidity. With loan demand remaining moderate, they sought other relatively high-yielding investments.

**Stock market:** In supplying funds to markets, investors were influenced in part by an abatement of inflationary expectations, which increased their willingness to make funds available in fixed-value form. There was a shift away from equities as a preferred form of asset holding, particularly at prices and yields that existed earlier in the year, and this culminated in the sharp break in stock prices during spring. The decline in prices seems to have represented in part investors' reassessment of stock prices in relation to earnings—in the light of diminished inflationary expectations and of a slowdown in the rate of economic expansion. The reassessment brought stock yields closer to interest rates on bonds, though still below them as they have been since mid-1959.

The total funds raised through Government and private security issues and bank and other loans after allowing for repayments reached a peak toward the end of last year, and has been lower, seasonably adjusted, in the past 6 months. But the amount of financing is still above earlier experience, except for late 1958 and 1959.

The decline has been the result mainly of lowered demands from private sectors of the economy. Federal Government financing has continued to be larger than usual for the first half of a year, with offerings in all maturity sectors. There were continued Treasury bill offerings throughout the first half of 1962, but in addition there were offerings in longer term sectors through both cash and refunding operations.

In private sectors, including State and local governments, long-term financing in the first half of 1962 has remained fairly substantial, lower than levels prevailing in the last three quarters of 1961, but above late 1958 and 1959. Demands have been sustained by continued sizable issues of corporate and State and local government securities and growth in mortgage financing. Short-term demands by private sectors have, meanwhile, fluctuated fairly widely, rising in the second half of 1961, and falling in the first half of this year, when business and other loan demands from banks, particularly loans for purchasing or carrying securities, became less active.

During the first half of 1962, short-term interest rates have been higher than in 1961, but long-term rates after receding earlier in the year rose about midway. The movement of interest rates in the first half of the year was strongly influenced by the public's preferences for time and savings deposits, coupled with commercial banks' investment policies. In addition, short-term rates were influenced by monetary and debt management policies designed to minimize balance-of-payments strains.

Yields on longer term U.S. Government, corporate, and most spectacularly, State and local government issues, declined through midspring and then rose. They have not yet reached earlier highs, however. Mortgage yields have continued to drift downward.

The easing of conditions in long-term sectors of the market earlier in the year reflected for the most part the increased availability of funds that was sparked by the public's response to the change in regulation Q affecting time deposit interest rates; in addition, there were continued heavy inflows to savings and loan associations and mutual savings banks. The early summer rise in rates was accompanied by a slowing down in the inflow of time and savings deposits to commercial banks and of funds to nonbank savings institutions. In addition, the reserve base of banks has grown more slowly in recent months.

Bank portfolio choices were not the only factors impinging on short-term rates, of course. To help the balance of payments situation, the Treasury offset downward pressures on the bill rate by increasing its offerings of short-term issues. Federal Reserve open market operations also served at times to moderate downward pressures on short-term rates. These actions served to minimize incentives for short-term capital to flow abroad. But they may also have had the effect of keeping long rates from declining more and, hence, domestic spending from rising more, mainly because short-term rates made liquidity too attractive in this period of uncertainty.

The economy's performance in the first half of the year has been below the expectation of most and the hopes of all, but we should nevertheless view it with a confidence that is commensurate with the resilience and strength shown in this period. The stock market reappraisal, the shift in fiscal operations, the inventory adjustment growing out of the steel settlement have each probably had significant dampening effects on the real economy.

The banking system appears to have responded to the actions of the Federal Reserve about as one would expect. Bank liquidity changed little in 1962. The level of excess reserves at the country banks averaged \$500 million in the last half of 1961 and \$440 million in the first half of 1962—about the same as in the past 5 years. The reserve city banks kept their own positions in close balance but were reluctant to go into debt at the 3-percent discount rate, given the apparent demand for loans and prevailing yields on investments. In this situation, without evident strong demand for bank loans from the

economy, expansion in money supply came to a halt before the beginning of this year. In their capacity as savings institutions, banks extended credit commensurate with the increase in their time and savings deposits.

The public's response has been more enigmatic. We do know that with the rising level of GNP, the intensity with which the money supply has been used continued to rise secularly and also cyclically. High yielding liquid assets gained in appeal—the idea of earning 4 percent on funds that were as good as cash and the promotion of this idea by financial intermediaries in a competitive struggle undoubtedly was a restraint of some kind on spending.

Looking at the figures, the total of liquid assets in the hands of the nonbank public has been rising faster than gross national product in the first half of the year. In expansionary periods the ratio of liquid assets to gross national product usually declines, as it did during most of 1961. So far as credit flows are concerned, total credit flows in the first half of 1962 were lower in relation to gross national product than they were in the first half of 1959, about the same stage of the earlier cycle. Similarly, private borrowing is lower in relation to expenditures, other than those by the Federal Government, for goods and services, than was the case in the earlier period.

We come down to the basic question of the past 6 months, could monetary policy have made a greater contribution to our overall economic well-being? The slower expansion thus far in 1962 suggests that a more aggressive monetary policy involving greater credit availability might have led to a fuller utilization of resources. The concern with the level of short-term rates has been a key factor in inhibiting policy. Against the possibility of more rapid economic growth we have had to balance the risk that reduced interest rates and greater liquidity might have worsened our balance of payments further.

## PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND WATERSHED PROTECTION PROJECTS

**Mr. METCALF.** Mr. President, on behalf of the chairman of the Public Works Committee, the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and in order that the Members of the Senate and House, particularly the Appropriations Committees, and other interested parties may be advised of projects approved by the Committee on Public Works, under the provisions of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, and the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, information on this subject.

The first is a list of eight public buildings projects, six projects for new buildings, and two projects for alterations to existing buildings.

Approval of these building projects is based on prospectuses submitted to the committee by the Administrator of General Services, or reports on surveys of Federal building needs, in compliance with the provisions of Public Law 294, 86th Congress. All these projects have been discussed with representatives of the General Services Administration, who justified the need for these buildings.

The small watershed protection projects were approved under the provisions of Public Law 566, 83d Congress, as amended.



There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

## NEW BUILDINGS

Location and project	Date of approval	Estimated cost
San Diego, Calif., courthouse and Federal office building.....	Sept. 18, 1962	\$22,584,000
Akron, Ohio, (2) courthouse and Federal office building, and post office.....	Aug. 22, 1962	11,693,000
Tulsa, Okla., additional court facilities to authorized building.....	-----do-----	1,699,000
Ft. Snelling, Minn.....	Sept. 18, 1962	16,419,000
Knoxville, Tenn., Federal office building.....	-----do-----	8,252,000
Washington, D.C., office building for HHFA.....	Sept. 27, 1962	32,000,000

## ALTERATIONS

Washington, D.C., South Building, Agriculture Department.....	Sept. 18, 1962	\$600,000
Washington, D.C., Old Post Office Building.....	-----do-----	718,000
Total.....	-----do-----	93,965,000

## WATERSHED PROJECTS

Brandywine Creek, Del.-Pa.....	Aug. 22, 1962	\$2,080,978
Tobesofkee Creek, Ga. (supplement).....	Oct. 2, 1962	964,358
Twin Caney Creek, Kans.....	Aug. 22, 1962	2,843,300
Cottonwood Creek, Okla.....	Oct. 2, 1962	3,837,355
Delaware Creek, Okla.....	-----do-----	1,117,684
Sandy Creek, Pa.....	Aug. 22, 1962	785,393
Salada Creek, Tex.....	-----do-----	3,994,298
Valley Creek, Tex.....	-----do-----	2,023,951
Boulder Lake, Wyo.....	Oct. 2, 1962	420,700
Total.....	-----do-----	18,008,017

## ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the call of the Legislative Calendar, under the rule, was dispensed with.

## BASIS LAID FOR OBTAINING BALANCED POSTAL BUDGET BY 1965

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, before this current session of Congress is adjourned, I want to call the attention of my colleagues to the basis laid in the postal rate and pay bill, H.R. 7927, for obtaining a balanced postal budget by 1965. I shall ask to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement concerning this matter which should be heartening to every Member of Congress.

As Senators will see from this statement, once the postal rate bill has run its course, the revenues and expenditures of our great Post Office Department will be in balance. It is my sincere hope that we shall be able to keep it in balance for many years to come.

It seems to me that, with the proper use of modern systems, we should be able to develop the efficiency necessary to increase volume and at the same time reduce unit costs. Under a Democratic Postmaster General, we have already made significant strides in the direction of increased efficiency and elimination of frills. I believe that studies to be commenced next year on mail classification, postal costs, and mechanization will go a long way toward attaining a balanced

postal budget, and will keep it so in the future.

I ask unanimous consent to have the statement previously referred to printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

## A BALANCED POSTAL BUDGET BY 1965

H.R. 7927, as amended in the Senate, provides rate increases in excess of those approved by the House committee in September 1961. The Senate version of this measure provides a firm basis for achieving a balanced postal budget by 1965. Recognizing, of course, that volume and expense will increase; nevertheless, as volume increases, so will revenues. Postal efficiency should permit volume increases at lower unit costs.

An analysis with respect to the deficit  
(In millions of dollars)

H.R. 7927 will produce.....	<sup>1</sup> 600
Public services allowed.....	<sup>2</sup> 373
ICC hike in parcel post revenues.....	<sup>3</sup> 135
Total additional income.....	1,108
Post deficit, fiscal year 1963.....	832
Additional postal pay (\$363,000,000 less 25 percent, or \$91,000,000).....	<sup>4</sup> 272

Total additional cost..... 1,104

<sup>1</sup> Any further upward adjustment in postal rates would be contrary to the 1958 act (Public Law 85-426) which provides that revenue and expense should be approximately equal, after adjustment for public services.

<sup>2</sup> Public service estimates adjusted upward resulting from pay modifications contained in H.R. 7927.

<sup>3</sup> Data contained in present ICC parcel post docket.

<sup>4</sup> Sec. 1007 of H.R. 7927 calls for the absorption of pay costs. The total cost to the Post Office of \$363,000,000 is adjusted by approximately 25 percent to allow for absorption. This absorption would be less than 2 percent of a \$5,000,000,000 postal budget. Such would appear reasonable in light of the Postmaster General's record to date, and the statement by the Deputy Postmaster General in 1961 that, given time and authority, the Post Office Department could save \$300,000,000 annually.

## STATE DEPARTMENT REBUTTALS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, some time ago, there was discussion on the Senate floor with regard to two incidents reported in the press. The first involved an article which appeared early in September by the reporters Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott. The article charged the existence of a note from Khrushchev to President Kennedy the weekend before the 1961 ill-fated Cuban invasion, a note threatening Soviet retaliation in West Berlin if the United States used American forces against Cuba.

At the time of that discussion I stated that I had asked the Department of State for clarification of the extent to which there was a connection between Berlin and Cuba and, specifically, to respond to the inquiry whether there was such a note from Mr. Khrushchev to President Kennedy.

I said that I would place in the RECORD later the reply from the Department of State. The Department of State has replied. It has denied the existence of such a written communication prior to the Bay of Pigs invasion. I ask unani-

mous consent to have that letter printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 10, 1962.

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING,  
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR KEATING: This letter is in further reply to the telephone inquiry from your office this past week as to whether a letter was received by the U.S. Government from Chairman Khrushchev immediately prior to the events at the Bay of Pigs in April 1961, wherein Khrushchev stated, in the words of your secretary, the Berlin issue will be raised if Cuba is invaded. I am informed that no such letter was received on the eve of those events.

Sincerely,

FREDERICK G. DUTTON.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, nevertheless, I am assured by the newsmen concerned, who are known as well-informed and responsible observers, that in its basic essentials their original charge was true and that such a message in some form or other was conveyed to the President prior to the fateful decision to withdraw full U.S. support from the invasion.

However, in compliance with the commitment which I made, I have placed in the RECORD the letter from the Department of State.

Secondly, Mr. President, a story appeared more recently charging that the U.S. labor attaché in Rome had brought pressure to bear on the Italian Government to induce it to compel the striking crewmembers of Cuba-bound Italian ships to return to work. The State Department denied this report promptly, categorically, and in considerable detail. I rejoice that there was no truth to this report and I congratulate the State Department on its immediate effort to clarify the situation.

I ask unanimous consent that that letter may also be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
Washington, D.C., September 25, 1962.

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING,  
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR KEATING: I understand that you are anxious to learn the circumstances behind the front-page story in the Washington Daily News of Friday, September 21, 1962, which quotes the National Maritime Union as alleging that our labor attaché in Rome had brought pressure to bear on the Italian Government to induce it to compel the striking crewmembers of two Cuba-bound Italian ships to return to work.

I am happy to be able to supply a full report. Our Embassy at Rome has denied the allegation and informed the press that it was "obviously nonsense." A senior official of the Italian Ministry of Merchant Marine has categorically denied to the Embassy that the Italian Government, for its part, had in any way attempted to induce the striking crewmembers of the two ships to continue the voyage. The Ministry official pointed out that under Italian law it was administratively impossible to force seamen to sail on a merchant ship, since hiring and firing of seamen is a matter strictly between the seamen, their unions, and the operators.

The only involvement of the labor attaché was to inquire of an official of the

leading Italian free labor union, which is not a party to the dispute, what was happening in the affair of the two ships, which had been reported in the Italian press. He did not in any way attempt to persuade the Italian Government to force Italian seamen to sail the ships. On the contrary, the Embassy had occasion earlier to point out to a representative of the company which operates one of the ships that any cargoes, even nonmilitary ones such as that involved in this case, were of assistance to the Soviet-run Castro regime.

You may also be interested to hear that on September 9, the Under Secretary of the Italian Ministry of Merchant Marine issued a strong public statement that supplying strategic Soviet material to the Communist dictatorial regime in Cuba would be in contempt of the obligations of Atlantic solidarity and in violation of Italy's adherence to NATO. The statement also warned that the Italian Government would take necessary action against anyone who violated the duties of the alliance in collusion with the enemy.

I hope this information will be of interest to you.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK G. DUTTON,  
Assistant Secretary.

#### MONTANA DAMS AND POWER PROJECTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in regard to the proposed Knowles Dam, I wish to state that in addition to my support of a multipurpose dam, on the same basis as the Hungry Horse Dam which was built in the Flathead country, that the following have been the stipulations which my colleague, the present presiding officer of the Senate and I have laid down as basis for our support of any Federal multipurpose project in the State of Montana. As I stated on Thursday last in the debate on the proposed Knowles Dam:

First. If the Senate and the House eventually authorize a proposal, it is the intention of my distinguished colleague and myself, as well as the Representative of the Western District of Montana in which the project is located, to see to it that a preferential proportion of the power generated in western Montana is kept in western Montana for the benefit of the people of the whole State. I wish to reiterate what I said then and to emphasize my position in this respect as strongly as I know how.

Second. The project must be feasible—I think it is feasible, but authorization of Knowles will call for more detailed planning and any doubt which may exist as to its feasibility will, I am sure, be then removed.

Third. People in the area directly affected must be in favor of the proposal.

Fourth. The present level of Flathead Lake must be maintained and nothing must be done to change the position of the inlet at Flathead Lake.

Fifth. The rights of the Indians must be protected and adequate compensation given for any rights or any loss which they may incur.

Mr. President, I repeat, this has been my position and the position of my colleague [Mr. METCALF], and our colleague in the House, Representative OLSEN, on any Federal multipurpose project in my State and will continue to be our posi-

tion on any proposals of this nature brought before the Senate or its committees for consideration.

#### TRIBUTE TO THE FOREIGN SERVICE

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, a recent issue of the Reader's Digest contained an article entitled "We Can Be Proud of Our Foreign Service." This is a readable article which sets forth a great many facts regarding our Foreign Service and some of the conditions of living and work which our Foreign Service personnel must endure.

I have often thought that those who are perhaps among the least appreciated in the service of this country are the Foreign Service people, including the Foreign Service officers themselves, and certainly including their wives and children, who spend many years at hardship posts.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### WE CAN BE PROUD OF OUR FOREIGN SERVICE (By Charles D. Lewis)

(It's not all striped-pants and cocktail parties, and service in a hardship post means exactly what it says. A businessman gives a carefully considered report.)

I was down on my farm in Virginia when one of my business friends telephoned from Florida to congratulate me: "I read in the papers that you're going to Washington to look over the State Department, Charlie. I hope you fire half of the sons-of-guns."

I laughed. "I'll do my best," I promised, and I meant it.

I'm a businessman. For the last 15 years I've been in the tobacco business, for five of those years as president of the American Sumatra Tobacco Corp., of New York. Now the State Department has invited me and five others—two businessmen, two labor leaders, and a university professor—to serve as public members on the 1961 Foreign Service selection boards.

The Foreign Service is the body which largely mans the policy offices of the State Department as well as our embassies and consulates overseas. It was going to be our job on the 1961 selection boards to study the record of every one of the 3,700 Foreign Service officers and to report what we found.

Over the years the talk among my friends and business associates has always been pretty much the same: the State Department in an ivory tower, full of dreamers, eggheads, incompetents. So I went to Washington expecting to find that a lot of bureaucratic heads should roll.

A few days later I was sitting at a stark metal table in an office of the State Department, with the other members of the board. Piled before us were 357 folders with Foreign Service performance stamped on them in big red capitals. These were the confidential personnel files on Foreign Service officers.

I eyed the files hesitantly, wondering what shocks they would contain. And they did contain some shocks, at least to my ideas of the Foreign Service. Later, I found that all the other public members had suffered a similar blow to their cherished conceptions.

When we compared notes, we found that the main ideas we had come to Washington with were these:

Idea: "Let's face it, the diplomatic life is pretty soft."

The files quickly dispelled that illusion for all of us, for good. Foreign Service officers

regularly and cheerfully take their families to live for years in places where I would hate to go on a 1-day business trip. On the average, they spend at least 1 out of every 3 years of their overseas service at a hardship post, which means they live in communities with no organized sanitation, no sewers except open ditches, no pest control. It means they rub shoulders daily and hourly with dysentery, sleeping sickness, yellow fever, hepatitis, and many other diseases; often the nearest adequate hospital facilities are more than 1,000 miles away. It means they lack schools for their children, do without dentists, boil their drinking and cooking water, and wash their food with potassium permanganate.

Disease is not the only hazard. A memorial plaque in a State Department lobby is a reminder: "William P. Boteler, killed by grenade, Cyprus, 1956. Robert Lee Mikels, burned to death attempting to save lives, Korea, 1951. Douglas Mackiernan, killed by gunfire, Tibet, 1950." And so on, down a long list of Foreign Service officers who have given their lives to get the job done.

One morning last fall the newspapers headlined stories about an FSO named Louis Hoffacker, consul at Elisabethville, in the Congo. Hoffacker had plunged fearlessly into a troop of excited Katanganese commandos to rescue a U.N. official who was being beaten senseless with rifle butts. That very day one of my associates was reading the past performance report on Hoffacker. Opposite the word "courage" was written "Nothing special to report."

Idea: "How are we going to fight the cold war in any foreign country when our Foreign Service people can't even speak the language?"

I'd often heard this one, and it made sense to me. Yet all the FSO's whose files I went through spoke at least one foreign language well; some spoke more than one, and a high proportion were studying to increase their skills. In non-English-speaking countries where the other major "world" languages (French, German, Spanish) are spoken, the majority of our Foreign Service officers speak the language. And in the Soviet Union virtually all our officers speak Russian.

In what it calls the "hard languages," the Foreign Service is driving to catch up with enormously multiplied demands. At last count, we had the respectable total of 17 Iranian-speaking officers in Teheran, 12 Chinese speakers in Taipei, 10 Japanese speakers in Tokyo, 8 Indonesian linguists in Jakarta. At our relatively small mission at Phnom Penh we have three men who speak Cambodian.

The service is still far behind the need in other important hard languages such as Arabic, Hindi, Thai and Vietnamese. To meet this problem, in the past 8 years nearly 500 Foreign Service officers have been put through full-time, hard-language training, for anywhere from 6 months to 2½ years at a time.

Idea: "Don't do anything, so you don't make any mistakes—that's the way to get ahead in the State Department."

I now know how little truth there is in that idea. There is only one way to get ahead in the Foreign Service: be picked for promotion by the impartial selection boards of experienced men who make their decisions on the basis of a man's complete record of service, in voluminous and revealing detail.

Every officer is the subject of a six- to eight-page performance rating by his immediate superior at least once a year. This rating, in turn, is reviewed by the next man up the line—particularly as to whether relations between the man being rated and the man doing the rating are what they should be. In addition, a Foreign Service inspector every year or so takes an expert look at each U.S. Embassy and consulate and makes



his own confidential report on every officer in the mission. When I finished reading through one of these files, covering 10 to 15 years' service, I felt I had known the man it dealt with for years.

I especially liked the sound of one man: When he learned that some American machinery had been left over, unsold, at an international fair in Tunis, he went out on his own and found a buyer for it, and drove a good bargain.

I got interested in another officer, in Korea, when I found he had chosen to live uncomfortably "on the economy," Korean style, not in the American compound. He was getting to know the people all right.

Still another FSO, in Baghdad, developed a central furniture-supply system for Foreign Service families coming and going; his initiative saved U.S. taxpayers \$65,000 in 14 months.

The State Department asked us not only to pick out officers for promotion but also to pick out a certain percentage to let go—the men and women who had reached their peak and stopped growing. This presented unexpected difficulty, for most of these people were competent, experienced officers. In my business, I wouldn't dream of letting employees of that caliber go. The other board members felt the same way. Our final report strongly recommended to the State Department that it find a way to make use of this valuable manpower, perhaps outside the Foreign Service.

Long before I finished my 3½ months' work, it was clear that over the years I had accepted a number of false ideas about the State Department and its personnel. I discovered that 6,000 to 8,000 young men and women apply for the Foreign Service every year. They have to pass stiff examinations, both written and oral. In the end, only about 200 of them are accepted.

The FSO's are virtually all college graduates, and more than half have done or are doing postgraduate work. The Foreign Service invests an estimated 6 percent of its manpower in full-time training of some kind every year. The other public members of the 1961 Foreign Service Selection Boards, most of whom had come to Washington with feelings very similar to mine, came to the same conclusions I did: Foreign Service work is not cocktail parties and striped-pants receptions. It's hard, down-to-earth work—like getting up in the middle of the night to try to get some Americans out of trouble somewhere; or scouring a foreign country to find new markets for U.S. goods, and working patiently and persistently to bargain down foreign tariff barriers against them.

It means giving all your waking hours to explaining and promoting the American way of thinking to opinion leaders whose attitude may be hostile or skeptical. It means working every day to keep well informed—well enough to warn Washington when trouble is building up. It means having the good judgment and initiative to know what steps can be taken to head off or deal with the trouble.

At the end of our work, the six public members of the boards went to see Secretary Rusk and handed him a letter, which was later forwarded to President Kennedy. I quote here the last paragraph:

"We are proud of these men and women of the Foreign Service. As American citizens, we want to strike a blow on their behalf against poorly informed criticism, and we feel it a privilege to convey to you our sincere praise of their abilities and accomplishments."

#### THE PLIGHT OF REFUGEES FLEEING FROM YUGOSLAVIA

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, with reference to the foreign aid bill, consid-

erable doubt as to the situation involving refugees has arisen among individuals interested in refugees fleeing from Communist countries. In the report of the House mention is made concerning the paradox of our country giving aid, for instance, to Communist Yugoslavia, and then giving aid to refugees from Communist Yugoslavia as they flee into Austria, Germany, and Italy.

These fugitives are trying to escape persecution in Yugoslavia. They have fled into Italy, Germany, and Austria; and, in some rare instances, they have been accepted into the asylum of those countries, but, in most instances, they have been ordered back to Yugoslavia by the screening committees.

The language used in the House report would throw some doubt upon whether it was intended that the moneys appropriated for the assistance of refugees might or might not be used to help legitimate and genuine refugees out of Yugoslavia. I do not believe that the language used in the report can be construed to mean that this money is precluded from being used to help the Yugoslavian refugees.

In any event, I have a letter which was written by His Excellency Edward E. Swanstrom, titular bishop of Arba, executive director. In this letter he encloses a paper discussing "The Plight of Refugees Fleeing From Yugoslavia."

He sets forth the distressing position occupied by these refugees. He points out that in many instances they have been sent back to Yugoslavia to suffer the torments of the final penalties imposed because they fled from Communist domination.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this document setting forth the problem as it exists in Yugoslavia and in the asylum countries may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the document was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### THE PLIGHT OF REFUGEES FLEEING FROM YUGOSLAVIA

Prior to the erection of the Berlin wall, East Germany was not the only refugee-producing Communist country in Europe. Mass flights occurred from other areas, such as Hungary in 1956, and year after year about 10,000 Yugoslav refugees have fled that country. Yet how many Americans know what a large segment of the Yugoslavs have not been able to obtain asylum in the West and that many have been forcibly returned to Yugoslavia?

It almost appears that it required a wall and the merciless terror of the Communist police at the wall to create concern for today's refugees and to have them accepted for what they are: victims of totalitarian oppression who flee from pervasive political, spiritual, and economic devastations which they correctly identify with the Communist system.

It is the same type of refugee who is seeking freedom, whether he comes from East Germany, Hungary, or Yugoslavia. Most are young, some are very young. Although they may not be able to articulate the reason which makes them come, it is invariably a desire to escape the police state, its totalitarian control as well as its economic deprivation. A man's yearning for freedom and human dignity is quite compatible with his hope of economic betterment.

Mass flights are always an expression of disaffection and opposition, the final protest where other protests are made impossible by political terror. Where people have no other vote, they are forced to vote with their feet. Our answer to the refugee problem is an index of the political imagination and the moral temper of the West.

The ambivalent attitude of the West toward Communist Yugoslavia has resulted in an ambivalent attitude toward Yugoslav refugees. Nothing can strengthen a totalitarian power so successfully as the feeling of resignation and apathy among its subjects. When we challenge the refugees' motivations, we appear unable to grasp why people would be fleeing and we seem to be turning our backs on them. When we acquiesce in the forcible return of escapees, we contribute to the feeling of hopelessness and thereby weaken the democratic cause within Yugoslavia—and without.

The age and the social background of most of the Yugoslav refugees, predominantly working class with a good admixture of peasant youth, instead of being interpreted as a symptom of the failure of the Yugoslav Government to gain the allegiance of the strata in whose name it purports to rule, have been used as proof of the economic character of the refugees' escape motivations. The refugees' opposition to communism is being impugned because they are poor. And because, when asked what they intend to do, they express a desire to work and to earn decent wages, it is adduced that they are not victims of Communist oppression and have not suffered from the absence of personal, political and religious freedom. It is as if the economic hardships to which they were exposed were not man made, the result of Communist misplanning. And it is as if a desire to work and to earn a decent living were in itself improper and shameful, an attitude which calls for the label "economic" refugee, that is one who does not deserve our sympathy and can be returned behind the Curtain without qualms. When misgivings do arise, they are dismissed, sometimes smugly and sometimes uneasily. The kind of repression rather than the repression itself is considered, and no attention is paid to the possibility of later retribution and the certainty that people who express their dissatisfaction with the regime by trying to escape from it will remain marked as enemies of the state. It is forgotten that the very act of escape makes a man an "enemy of the state."

Everyone knows that in Communist countries, the economy is a phase of politics. In those countries where people are not free to choose their own political creed, they are not free to make their own way in the social and economic field. Freedom of initiative is either nonexistent or is permitted on a minimum scale. Savings are meaningless because sooner or later the state swallows everything. Plans for the future are better left unmade. Everyone knows what civic and family life has been reduced to. Now, with all this, when someone escapes from such distressing conditions can he really be considered an "economic" refugee?

Is physical persecution necessarily physical torture? The loss of freedom, political pressure and its inevitable consequence—economic misery—are also persecution; veiled persecution, daily persecution, persecution which these young people feel deeply, although they are often unable to give expression to their feeling, for lack of education, or difficulty in choosing the right words.

Even those few Yugoslavs who are granted asylum are frequently put in a lower category than refugees from other Communist countries by the U.S. escapee program. Thus Yugoslavs either do not qualify as refugees or they are treated as second-class refugees.

And when they come before the so-called Screening Commissions in the West, having crossed the Rubicon, although they have, for very valid reasons, chosen to be, as it were, "without family, without country and without means," the only thing they find to say is "We came away to be free and to find work." Then we say, "They are young, they ran away from their parents; discipline; they are, as you can see, economic refugees."

Should we not give the matter a little more thought? There are many who are discontented with their jobs or unemployed. Do you think that they would, even with a passport, i.e., without any risk to themselves leave Belgium, for example, leave it forever, abandoning their families, their possessions for the unknown?

A further contention is that by permitting Yugoslav refugees to stay in Western Europe or by accepting them for immigration in the Western Hemisphere, we are alleviating Communist Yugoslavia's economic problems and underemployment. If this were true, Tito could have done better by negotiating labor agreements with other European countries which have manpower shortages. The 10,000 refugees from Yugoslavia annually do not alter the employment picture inside Yugoslavia to any appreciable degree. Even if it were the policy of the West to aggravate the economic difficulties of Yugoslavia, as it clearly has not been, these goals should not be pursued at the expense of the refugees, the victims of Tito's brand of communism.

The repression of freedom of religion and other fundamental human rights in Yugoslavia hardly differs even in degree from that practiced in the U.S.S.R. itself. Yet the subtle campaign of the Yugoslav authorities to popularize the term "economic" refugee has been more than successful. It has carried over into the language of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and that of certain officials of the U.S. Government. It has influenced the policy of countries which formerly granted asylum to these refugees to the point where substantial numbers of them are now being repatriated instead of welcomed. It has created a situation where Italy permits most of those fleeing to remain on its soil, but Austria, using U.S. equivocal policies as an excuse, forcibly returns the majority of the Yugoslav refugees. It has resulted in drastic reductions in U.S. aid to refugees from Yugoslavia. It has resulted in resentment by true democratic people from Yugoslavia who see U.S. aid helping to build a strong Communist state, but refusing to help those anti-Communist elements that escape its oppression. It has caused confusion among the Americans because policy-makers fail to understand that the basic philosophy of the Communist state is the same, whether that of the Soviet Union, China, or Yugoslavia.

American policy today leaves refugees bewildered by its policy of being selective about the kind of communism and oppression from which a person must flee in order to benefit from the help of the American people.

At a time when we are granting asylum to thousands of refugees from Castro's communism, which, supported by Soviet communism, is threatening the Western Hemisphere, should the United States not take a forthright stand and give full recognition to the refugees fleeing Yugoslavia which is today linked again with the Soviet in its conspiracy to have communism dominate the world?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I contemplate discussing this subject with the chairman of the conference committee and obtaining a definite understanding of what is meant by the language.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. STENNIS. Is the Senate still in the morning hour?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is still in the morning hour.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Mississippi will wait until the end of the morning hour.

#### SIXTEENTH ANNIVERSARY OF EXECUTION OF NICOLA PETKOV, BULGARIAN PATRIOT

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, September 23 marked the 16th anniversary of the execution of the great Bulgarian patriot, Nicola Petkov, by the Soviet quisling regime in Bulgaria. I think it is proper that we should observe this anniversary by retelling the story of Nicola Petkov, because, to my mind, it is one of the great personal sagas of the unending fight for human freedom.

No man believed more sincerely in the possibility of cooperating with the Soviets than did Nicola Petkov. No man paid more dearly for this belief. No man conducted himself with greater courage when once he discovered his error, nor confronted his executioners with greater dignity. No man in our time has accepted personal martyrdom with clearer foreknowledge of the consequences of his actions, both in terms of his immediate personal fate and in terms of its ultimate significance for the fate of his people. No anti-Communist leader in any country has ever led a more determined, more heroic opposition, in Parliament and out of Parliament, against apparently hopeless odds.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks an article entitled "Bravest Democrat of All," which appeared in the Saturday Evening Post for December 6, 1947. This article tells the story of Nicola Petkov in the words of Dr. G. M. Dimitrov, Petkov's chief friend and political collaborator, the recognized leader of the democratic opposition in Bulgaria until Soviet pressure compelled him to resign his post in favor of Petkov, and the recognized leader today of the Bulgarian democratic opposition in exile.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### BRAVEST DEMOCRAT OF ALL

(By Dr. Georgi Dimitrov, as told to David Martin)

Nicola Petkov is dead. Bulgaria has lost a truly great patriot, the democratic world has lost a leader who was a moral giant. The three visiting American Congressmen who, a week after his death, placed a wreath on his unmarked grave in a Sofia cemetery, did not exaggerate when they described him as "one of the greatest democrats of all time." I think he was the bravest democrat of all.

No man believed more sincerely in the possibility of collaborating with the Soviets than did Nicola Petkov. No man paid more dearly for this belief. No man conducted himself with greater courage when once he discovered his error, nor confronted his executioners with greater dignity.

His is a tragedy pregnant with significance for a democratic world that is still contem-

plating, Hamlet-like, the pros and cons of the very problem on which Petkov met his doom.

Petkov was deprived of his parliamentary immunity on June 5 of this year and immediately arrested. Shortly afterward he was brought to trial on a fantastic list of charges—that he had acted as an agent of foreign powers, that he had participated in a military conspiracy to overthrow the Bulgarian Government, that he had urged the peasants to sabotage the regime by destroying their crops. On August 16 he was convicted and sentenced to death.

On August 18 the State Department addressed a note to the Soviet Deputy Acting Chairman of the Allied Control Commission, urging that the Commission review the case of Petkov. The note spoke of "a gross miscarriage of justice" and indicated that the State Department considered the trial of Petkov a violation of the Yalta agreement, which ostensibly guaranteed the rights of the opposition.

The Soviets replied that intervention on behalf of Petkov would be a violation of Bulgaria's national sovereignty. In the early morning of September 23, Petkov was hanged in Sofia prison. To the last, he stubbornly refused to appeal for clemency, because he held that he had been unjustly convicted.

In striking at Petkov, the dark powers that rule Bulgaria were aiming not so much at Petkov the man as at the United States and Western democracy. "If we execute Petkov," reasoned Premier Georgi Dimitrov and the Communist hatchetmen, "this will demonstrate to the entire opposition how powerless the great democracies are to defend them, and how senselessly futile their opposition to communism has therefore become. And now that the democracies have made their empty protests on his behalf, our little demonstration will be doubled, reinforced."

Ever since January 1945 when, under Communist pressure, I handed over the secretaryship of our party to Petkov, I have been in direct or indirect touch with either Petkov or mutual colleagues. Before that, I had known him intimately since 1931. I think that I am in a better position than any other man to tell the story of Nicola Petkov and of his disastrous efforts to collaborate with the Communists.

Petkov died in the tradition of his family—he came of a family which seems to have been uniquely destined for martyrdom. His father, Dimitar Petkov, lost an arm in the war against the Turks and was decorated by Czar Alexander II of Russia for his bravery. But when he realized that the Russians planned to convert Bulgaria into a province of their own, he turned against them and led an agitation that resulted in the expulsion of Alexander's generals from the country. Several years afterward a grateful people elected him Premier. A staunch upholder of the constitution, he soon came into conflict with the autocratic King Ferdinand I. In 1907, Dimitar Petkov was shot down on Boulevard Alexander II in Sofia by agents of the monarchy.

Petkov's brother, Petko D. Petkov, assumed the leadership of the Agrarian Party after the assassination of the great Alexander Stambulsky on June 14, 1923. Undeterred by threats, Petko Petkov from his seat in Parliament mercilessly excoriated the increasingly Fascist nature of the regime of Professor Tsankov and continued to fight for Alexander Stambulsky's ideal of Balkan and European federation. On June 14, 1924, 1 year to the day after the assassination of Stambulsky, he was shot down by assassins directly in front of the palace. When the day of his funeral arrived, Sofia was inundated by a sea of peasants who flowed to the capital from all over Bulgaria to pay homage to their leader. And now the Communist reaction has taken the life of the last male member of the Petkov family.



I first met Nicola Petkov in Paris in 1930. The opposition in Bulgaria was preparing to make a bid for power, and we were anxious to have him join us. Petkov at that time was leading the life of a young aristocrat and had no profound interest in politics. But he was strongly influenced by the memory of his father and his brother, and shortly after the triumph of the opposition in the elections of June 1931, he assumed the editorship of our party organ.

My first impression of Petkov was not altogether favorable. Though his shoulders were broad and his body seemed strong, he had suffered from various maladies in consequence of which he walked with an awkwardly limp slouch and his hands frequently trembled. His manner was so diffident that his circle of friends was restricted. When he spoke, he invariably looked down to avoid the eyes of his company. This young aristocrat obviously lacked the common touch that his brother Petko had possessed, and it also seemed to me that he lacked the willpower and courage of his brother. In this estimate, as events have proved, I was completely mistaken. The limp posture, the trembling hands, the downcast eyes, concealed a spirit as courageous and uncompromising as Petko Petkov at his greatest.

The period of legality lasted for only 3 years after Petkov's return. In May 1934, the reaction staged a coup d'etat and installed a dictatorship under the premiership of Kimion Georgiev, who today holds the post of Foreign Minister in the Communist Government of Bulgaria. In 1938, however, the Government again agreed to hold elections, and Petkov was elected deputy. In Parliament he conducted himself with boldness, with the result that he was soon expelled by the reactionary majority.

Then came the war. After the defeat of Poland and France, the German pressure on the Balkans grew immeasurably stronger. Aware that this might involve us in the conflict, I approached the leaders of all the democratic and anti-German parties to suggest joint action against such an eventuality. On February 21, 1941, we forwarded to King Boris a memorandum signed by the leaders of 10 parties, in which we urged a termination of the Government's pro-German policy and adherence to strict neutrality. At 4 o'clock next morning, I was arrested by the police. When the inspector in charge turned his back to argue with my wife, I escaped out of the kitchen door and over the garden wall.

Anticipating my arrest, I had taken Petkov with me to our final meeting and had introduced him to our leaders. The understanding was that if anything happened to me, he would take over in my stead. I myself, after a period in hiding, escaped from the country via Yugoslavia. When German forces entered Bulgaria on March 1, 1941, Petkov was sent to a concentration camp. He was released some 3 months later.

Although a tyro in underground activity, Petkov now took to it with the skill of a veteran. My one difference with him was that he collaborated somewhat too closely with the Communists. He was sympathetic to Russia and he was impressed by the audacity of the Bulgarian Communists. He helped them liberally not merely with his personal funds but even with the funds of the Agrarian Party.

The original united front against the Government's pro-German policy had consisted of 10 parties ranging from the Communist Party on the left to the conservative democratic parties on the right. Now Petkov was engineered into abandoning this coalition in favor of the Fatherland Front, which included only three major parties—the Agrarians, the Communists, and the Socialists—and two minor groupings. Although the program adopted by the Fatherland Front was all that a democrat could have asked, it

was obvious from the beginning that the Communists would exert far more influence than they could have exerted in a broader coalition.

Petkov was interned again in January 1944, but released in time to play a leading role in the coup d'etat of September 8, 1944. During August, the government of Premier Bagrianov had entered into negotiations for an armistice with Britain and America. For some reason never explained, the British and Americans hedged and made conditions—as though the proximity of the Red army to the Bulgarian frontier meant nothing at all. On September 6 the government of Moraviev, which had superseded that of Bagrianov on September 1, decided to declare war on Germany. The proclamation was not published because certain crypto-Communists close to the Minister of War urged postponement until September 8. On September 8 the Soviet Union, in an act as Machiavellian as its pact with Hitler, declared war on Bulgaria. The Red army poured over the frontier. That same day the Fatherland Front, with the support of the Military League, staged a coup and arrested the Government—which had already declared war on Germany. But the Red army continued its advance until it stood on Bulgaria's southern frontier, menacing Turkey.

I returned to Sofia on September 23. The moment I crossed the frontier, I was met by a delegation of party members. They said the situation was rapidly building up to catastrophe. Communist-controlled police and the Communist-organized militia had already instituted a reign of terror. Hundreds had been arrested, scores had been shot. They implored me to do something.

The narrowness of the Fatherland Front and the timing of its coup had worked in favor of the Communists. After the coup, a provisional government had been set up in which the Communists had reserved for themselves the Ministry of the Interior and the Ministry of Justice, as well as effective control of the Ministry of War. To their posts of lesser importance; Petkov himself was given a ministry without portfolio.

Petkov was beginning to realize the importance of the concessions which, out of sheer political naivete, he had made to the Communists. His first words to me when we met were, "Thank God you've come back. I'm afraid we've made an awful mess of things."

He explained that, at the time the Government had been formed, the Communists, with Russian backing, had posed the matter in such a way that the alternatives seemed to be either a coalition on the terms of the Communists or else a government of the Communist Party. "Frankly," he said, "I didn't realize how much I was conceding, otherwise I should have refused."

On October 12, 1944, Petkov left for Moscow as a member of an armistice delegation representing all parties in the Fatherland Front. The armistice was signed on October 28. When I met Petkov on his return from Moscow, there was the look of a hunted man in his eyes. "I must speak to you in private," he said in a furtive whisper.

A few hours later we met in his apartment. Petkov, his hands trembling more than usual, began speaking—for the first time in our long friendship he looked directly into my eyes as he spoke. "The Russians want to split our party. Central Europe belongs to the Soviet sphere, they said, and our party could only hope to survive if it purged itself of Dr. Dimitrov and the other anti-Soviet elements. They urged me to assume the leadership to carry out such a program. I tried to tell them that you were a friend of the Russian people, but it wasn't of any use. Georgi Dimitrov especially is dead set against you."

"It isn't just a matter of splitting our party," I replied. "The Communists want to

destroy our party because they see in the peasant movement the chief obstacle to their dictatorship."

Toward 9 o'clock the other ministers of the Agrarian Party came to the apartment. Petkov reported to us on certain personal observations he had made in Russia. The thing that appalled him more than anything else was the fantastic luxury in which the proletarian bureaucrats basked whilst their people were starving. The Bulgarian delegation had been invited to dinner by Georgi Dimitrov, one-time leader of the Bulgarian Communist Party, now a Russian citizen for more than 20 years. The dinner was oriental in its extravagance. There was course after course after course—caviar, and roast duck and other viands, and rare delicacies that Petkov had seen nowhere since before the war, and vodka served in glasses of pure crystal. In December 1944, 6 weeks after his return from Moscow, the Communists informed Petkov that I would have to resign as general secretary of the party, or else. Realizing there was no alternative at this stage, I handed over my office to Petkov, whom the Communists made clear they favored. For his part, he still believed he could effect a reconciliation with them. So, Dr. Georgi Dimitrov, the anti-Soviet fanatic, had been removed, and Nicola Petkov, lifelong friend of the Soviets had taken my place. In a speech on January 21, 1945, the day of my resignation, Communist Vice Premier Dobre Tarpeshev gushed, "If I were a woman, I can think of no one I would rather marry than Nicola Petkov."

But it was not long before the Communists came forward with new demands. They asked Petkov to dismiss the entire central committee and replace them with men they designated. Petkov, whose resistance was still in the process of hardening, compromised to the extent of accepting a few Communist stooges in subordinate positions and in the youth organization. Further than this he refused to go. For more than 3 months the Communists piled their pressures, waiting for Petkov to weaken. Instead, his attitude grew more stubborn. Finally, realizing that their plan to capture the party through Petkov had failed, they decided on a frontal attack.

Through our own agents in Communist headquarters we learned that they were preparing to arrest me and several score of our party leaders. I was to make a confession, and then disappear in the manner of Bela Kovacs. The others were to be brought to trial, and through my own confession and their confessions the Agrarian Party was to be so compromised that they would have a legal pretext for outlawing it.

On April 23, while convalescing from a serious attack of pneumonia, I was formally placed under house arrest. Before the police disconnected my telephone, my wife put through a call to Petkov. Ignoring the danger to himself, he immediately came to see me. Trembling with anger, he called the Minister of the Interior, demanding the reason for my arrest. The minister answered coldly that I had been arrested "in the interest of national security."

"In the interest of the national security," replied Petkov, "you are arresting the man who has done more to promote the national security than any other living Bulgarian. Some day you will regret your action."

The Petkov I saw at this last meeting was a completely changed man from the Petkov of 8 months previous. Gone were his illusions about cooperating with the Communists. The man with the diffident manner and the downcast eyes had become a lion. He looked both friend and foe squarely in the eyes, and when he spoke to his foes he literally roared.

On May 8, the Communists convoked a special convention of the Agrarian Party attended by several hundred picked stool

pigeons. The convention voted in a new executive. The Ministry of the Interior ruled that our party headquarters, our newspaper, our treasury, and all our possessions were the rightful property of this newly elected executive of the Bulgarian Agrarian Union.

Petkov alone of the old executive was invited to join the new executive. He refused pointblank. Instead, he set up party headquarters in his own home and began to plan a campaign of resistance in open defiance of the secret police.

On May 24, I slid down a drainpipe, walked out of the alley dressed in overalls, walked past the Communist military guards surrounding the house, and took refuge in the American Embassy. My escape threw a monkey wrench into the preparations the Communists were making for their sham trial. Without my confession, the performance would have impressed no one. The trial was called off.

In July the Government announced that elections would take place within 1 month and that there would be only one ticket, the list of the Fatherland Front. Petkov immediately sent a strong letter to the Allied Control Commission, demanding that it guarantee the right of the opposition to its own electoral ticket in accordance with the terms of the Yalta agreement, and urging that the elections be supervised by an international commission. In early August, without any prior notification to Petkov, the Government announced that Petkov had resigned his ministry. In protest, all the remaining ministers of the Agrarian Party, the Socialist Party, and the Independent Intellectual Party, resigned from the Government.

At this point the British and American Governments intervened. Apparently yielding to their pressure, the Bulgarian Government agreed to postpone the elections, and to permit opposition candidates. Petkov was permitted officially to reestablish party headquarters and to publish his own newspaper.

But the improvement did not last very long. In violation of their August agreement, the Government announced that the elections would be held on November 18. Though the three opposition parties decided to boycott the elections, the campaign was so bitterly fought that the Peasant Party alone had more than a score of its followers killed. The opposition, in a statement signed by Petkov for the Agrarians, Lulchev for the Socialists, and Professor Stoyanov for the Independent Intellectuals, declared that the majority of the people had not voted and that the Government had therefore lost the election. They demanded an investigation. The Communists replied that the Fatherland Front had got more than 75 percent of the eligible vote. Their collaborators of the Zveno Group, however, put out the slightly more modest figure of 65 percent. The discrepancy made the people laugh.

At the Moscow conference of December 1945 the Russians made one of their many meaningless compromises. They agreed to advise the Bulgarian Government of the desirability of including in the Government, during the interim period, two representatives of the opposition. It was no less a person than Deputy Foreign Minister Vishinsky who went to Bulgaria to implement this arrangement. Vishinsky summoned Petkov and two other opposition leaders and said to them—as bluntly as this, “It is the order of Generalissimo Stalin that two members of your combined opposition enter the Government immediately and unconditionally.”

“I do not take orders from any foreign power,” replied Petkov coldly. “I take orders only from my people and my party.” Lulchev and Stoyanov backed him up. The conversations with Vishinsky ended.

The Communists were worried by Petkov's recalcitrance because they knew that he accurately reflected the temper of the people. After Vishinsky's departure, the Government again approached him. This time, to the amazement of all, they accepted almost all of Petkov's conditions, including separate electoral lists and an Agrarian Minister of Justice. The agreement was concluded in the afternoon on March 28, 1946. That same evening, the Soviet minister to Bulgaria, Kirsanov, delivered an ultimatum protesting the agreement. The following morning a government was constituted minus the opposition—and it was announced that there would be elections to a Constituent Assembly on October 27.

Petkov now began a campaign which, for sheer heroism, is unsurpassed in the annals of any opposition. With the Red army still in the country, and with the Communist-controlled police breaking up their meetings, the opposition attacked the Government and the Communists and Soviet intervention as recklessly as though they enjoyed the protection of the American Constitution. Petkov's paper, during the preelectoral period especially, was an inspiration to read. “What our people must show,” said the Banner for October 12, “is de l'audace, et encore de l'audace, et toujours de l'audace.” The following day, under the caption “Where are the Agrarian Deputies?” it charged that the Agrarian Party had not been permitted to put up candidates in 25 percent of the constituencies and that of the candidates for the other constituencies, almost 50 were under arrest. “Freedom does not come on a silver platter,” wrote Petkov on October 15. “Freedom is something for which you must fight.”

To the Communists' protestations that they had no intention of taking the peasants' property, Petkov replied with the most devastating slogan of the electoral campaign: “As the wolf cannot watch over your flocks, as the fox cannot befriend your hens, so the Communists cannot protect private property. Electors vote without any fear against the Communist constitution, against the Communist dictatorship.”

On October 20, the opposition finally was granted permission to hold an open meeting in Sofia—without loudspeakers or lights. Despite all the restrictions, more than 200,000 angry peasants swarmed into Sofia and joined the city workers and middle class in the most impressive demonstration of the entire electoral campaign. “Down with the dictatorship,” they roared. “Down with Red fascism. We want Petkov.”

The success of the meeting resulted in an intensification of the terror. In the 3 days before the elections, 24 members of the Agrarian Party were killed. The Communist leader, Georgi Dimitrov, who had been a resident of Russia for 13 years and who had returned to Bulgaria only 2 days before the election—it is not clear whether he resigned his Soviet citizenship—thundered against Petkov in his first declaration, “We have to remind the leader of the opposition of the fate of Drazha Mihailovich.”

When the election results were announced, the opposition was credited with 101 deputies against 364 for the Fatherland Front. The Agrarian member sent a protest to the election commission in which he gave details of the terror against the opposition. “What has taken place,” he said, “was not an election, but a war between the police and the people. The elections were without any question fraudulent.”

When the Constituent Assembly convened on November 8, the opposition opened the session by shouting, “Long live liberty. Down with the dictatorship.” In the sessions that followed, the figure of Nicola Petkov, hurling castigation and defiance at the Communist majority, completely dom-

inated the Assembly. Georgi Dimitrov, who, as a proletarian revolutionary, had towered over his Nazi prosecutors at Leipzig, now, as a totalitarian bureaucrat, shrank to the stature of a pygmy. Without either moral or rational ground to stand on, he could do nothing but reply to Petkov with abuse—“anti-Soviet dog” was one choice term—or with crude threats.

When Georgi Dimitrov shouted that the future belonged to the Communists, Petkov intervened, “The future belongs not to you, Mr. Dimitrov, but to the people. You are not a god, Mr. Dimitrov, though you may deceive yourself on this score by taking into your party only those who accept you as their god. Your program is one word: dictatorship. Our program is also one word: liberty.”

On January 30, 1947, Dimitrov made his first direct threat to Petkov. After roaring that “Koev must be hanged.” (Peter Koev was one of Petkov's chief aids) he went on to say that the Government possessed documents involving the leader of the opposition. The following is a condensation of the exchange that took place.

Petkov. Are you a satrap, that you issue such summary condemnations? After all, you are not a god—you are not even a qualified judge. As for the documents of which you speak, I challenge you to produce them.

Dimitrov. Very soon you will receive your documents. When you do, not one of you will remain in this Assembly. There is no place in this Assembly for foreign agents.

Petkov. You speak of foreign agents. For 20 years, you, Mr. Dimitrov, were a citizen of a foreign country. You became a Bulgarian citizen only 2 days before the election. You have no right even to speak as a Bulgarian.

The battle grew in intensity. On April 3, one of the opposition deputies got up and made the accusation that under article 4 of the armistice, the Communist Party was a Fascist organization and should accordingly be dissolved. The Communists, outnumbering the opposition almost 4 to 1, rushed across the floor and engaged them in a terribly unequal battle in which many of the opposition were injured. The opposition left the chamber en masse, by way of protest.

The next day they were back in their places to renew the struggle. An Agrarian woman deputy charged that the Communist Party was squandering public funds by making all of their members eligible for the special allotments voted to active partisans. Again the Communist majority charged the opposition. Again the opposition left the chamber with their heads bloody. Again they came back the following day.

And so it went, until the final arrest of Petkov and the dissolution of his party.

The bulk of the evidence against Petkov consisted of confessions purportedly made by his fellow conspirators. The most important of these was the confession of Peter Koev, the Petkov aid who had been arrested in mid-January 1947. Koev had been arrested once before, in August 1946. While he was in prison he had been elected to Parliament and, in consequence of parliamentary immunity, he had been released. On his release he sent a letter to his leader, Petkov, which Petkov had the courage to read to the assembly.

“They reduce you to a state of utter moral and physical prostration,” said Koev's letter, “in which you become indifferent to your fate and to life itself, so that you desire some solution—any solution—so long as it will put an end to the intolerable suffering. Contrary to normal juridical procedure, you are condemned first, and it is only afterwards that they begin to search for accusations and proofs. These are obtained by means of three types of torture: physiological torture—hunger, lack of sleep, thirst; physical tortures—beatings and being compelled to



stand upright for days and nights on end; psychological tortures—insinuations that your family has been incarcerated, etc.

"I remained for 21 days in solitary confinement without being interrogated. During this time they subjected me to the hunger treatment—a bit of bread and water each day. The obvious purpose of this treatment is to produce physical attrition and a corresponding weakening of your will. At 8 a.m. one Saturday they took me up to the fourth floor to be interrogated. The interrogation went on for 5 days without interruption, 24 hours a day. The interrogator was changed every 3 hours, while I was compelled to remain standing, handcuffed, without sleep, unable to support myself either against the table or against the wall, without food and—that was cruellest of all during those suffocatingly hot August days and nights—without water. Every 3 hours the same questions were repeated until I became unconscious. My bare feet swelled to unimaginable proportions. The interrogators showed not the faintest pity. On the 5th day they threw me into an empty cell, where I slept like a dead man for more than 12 hours.

On the 4 succeeding nights Koev was trussed and beaten on the soles of his feet for 3 or more hours on end, with interludes during which he was questioned by Inspector Zeyev.

"During the balance of my detention," concluded the letter, "I was asked no questions, but I remained the object of a campaign of moral pressure and psychological terror. They applied refined tortures of such a kind—allusions to the fate of my family, the safety of my children, etc.—that I would honestly have preferred physical tortures."

When Koev was deprived of his parliamentary immunity on the occasion of his second arrest, he made this final declaration before leaving the Parliament, "I am innocent. I know, however, that through me you are attempting to strike at the general secretary of our party, Nicola Petkov. My final words are that only the declarations which I make before you now correspond to the truth, and that, if it should happen later that, after a period of instruction, I should make some confessions, they will have been extorted from me by means of violence."

Koev made his confessions and was sentenced to 12 years. He will never emerge alive. Petkov, though he defended himself heroically and admitted nothing, was sentenced to death.

I salute the memory of one of the great spirits of our time. To Nicola Petkov there can be no other monument than the liberation of his people from Communist tyranny.

#### TRIBUTE TO SENATOR CLARK

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Washington Post paying tribute to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and others for their efforts to defeat the mail censorship provision of the postal bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

##### HOLDING UP THE MAIL

The Senate's watered-down version of the Cunningham amendment authorizing the interception of mail material from abroad which may be called Communist propaganda has now been accepted by both Chambers and sent to the White House for Presidential endorsement. Since this Senate version had administration approval as a price which had to be paid for the postal rate bill, it is, no doubt, idle and unrealistic to suggest that it ought to be vetoed by the President. It

represents, nevertheless, a futile and silly adoption of a Communist technique and it constitutes a reflection on the fundamental traditions of a free America.

The adopted version, as Senator JOSEPH CLARK summarized it, provides that mail matter, except in sealed letters, prepared in a foreign country and which the Secretary of the Treasury, not the Attorney General, thinks is Communist political propaganda, shall be detained by the Postmaster General upon its arrival in the United States. Thereupon, the addressee is to be notified that such matter has been received, and he will receive it only if he requests it. This slows up mail delivery, institutes an official censorship, impedes study and understanding of Communist ideas, invites reprisals against mail from the United States sent abroad and treats Americans as though their loyalty to American institutions could not be trusted.

But because it bears a specious appearance of being anti-Communist, this essentially anti-American legislation was whooped to enactment. A few Members of the Senate stood superbly against it. They were led by Senator CLARK, despite the fact that he is now involved in a tough election campaign. In committee and on the Senate floor, he argued against this silly measure with reason and eloquence and understanding of American values. He was ably supported by Senators RANDOLPH, YARBOROUGH, and PELL. They deserve the country's respect and gratitude.

Senator CLARK said in the course of the debate that he believes that the amendment authorizes censorship prohibited by the Constitution. We hope the administration will cooperate to make possible a judicial test of the amendment's constitutionality.

#### BETTER JOBS FOR MORE AMERICANS

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, late last month Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, of St. Louis County, Mo., came out with a new book entitled "Eighty-seven Million Jobs—A Dynamic Program To End Unemployment." This book, which is a fresh and penetrating analysis of this country's unemployment problem, has been most favorably reviewed by the critics. I, myself, had an opportunity to review the book for Rollcall and found it a highly stimulating and original study of some of our major economic problems.

An article by Representative CURTIS, entitled "Better Jobs for More Americans," appears in the November 1962 issue of Advance magazine and gives an outline of the ideas more fully presented in his book. I ask unanimous consent that this article from Advance be included in the RECORD. I also ask unanimous consent that my review of the book, as well as a number of other reviews written for leading newspapers, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

##### BETTER JOBS FOR MORE AMERICANS—A DYNAMIC PROGRAM TO END UNEMPLOYMENT (By Representative TOM B. CURTIS)

Our dynamic economy has created a demand for so many skills of so many new and different sorts that we have, in amazing fact, developed large labor shortages. This is the crux of the so-called unemployment problem: not the lack of jobs, but the lack of skills to fill available jobs. This is the growing pain of our economy—it is not the fatal sickness of a sick economy, as those

who see only the job wanted but never the help wanted columns of our papers so often say.

Most of the unfilled job requirements are known only in general terms, however.

##### THE NEEDS

We need many more engineers, in old as well as altogether new fields. We need more doctors, more nurses, more garage mechanics, more lab technicians, more scientists of all sorts, more teachers with more and varied training, more salesmen with genuine technical expertise about their complex products, more management technicians, more computer operators, more computer designers, more computer programmers, more highly skilled production workers. More, more, and still more, as each new wave of skills breeds the machines and the services that demand ever more skills and creates ever more jobs in new fields.

Newspapers are filled with advertising for needed skills. Many employers no longer use such columns because their experience has shown that the necessary skills simply are not available. In such cases they undertake to train people to fill these jobs.

What is more, the skill requirements of our dynamic economy are snowballing. The Department of Labor recently estimated that about 5,000 new job titles will be added to its dictionary of occupational titles in the decade of the sixties. During the same period some 8 to 10 percent of current job titles will become obsolete.

Since technological growth and heads-up innovating management create a demand for more jobs than they make obsolete, our basic task as a nation is to find the ways to meet such a demand.

The cost, surprisingly in the age of so much Federal spending, is bound to be relatively low and in a sense self-liquidating. Work at higher skills obviously pays more, which enlarges the tax base, other things being equal. Also, success in this endeavor will reduce the incentive for featherbedding, which fear of technological unemployment frequently generates. The resulting greater productivity will also serve to expand the tax base. Then, billions now spent in all manner of Government programs to conceal unemployment in the fog of inflation could be saved and Federal taxes accordingly cut to the bone.

##### THE CONCEPT

A successful attack on unemployment even gives great promise of increasing a general understanding of the role of government in our society. Government is ancillary, a handmaiden of the private sector. Government is not a copartner of the people. It is their servant, and government jobs are created only when individuals in their private enterprise create a demand for ancillary assistance. This, and not the State concept of government as a big spender, should guide us in the era ahead.

Of all the things the Government might be tempted to do in finding answers to job problems, the most necessary first step is to satisfy requirements for relevant information about emerging skill requirements as well as about the pattern of unneeded skills. We must upgrade skills across the land, but "upgrade for what?"

1. Urgently necessary are answers based on an analytical, nationwide study of the skills of the future, emerging skills of the present, and obsolescent skills of the past. Such answers are needed, negatively, lest we retrain men, as we are unfortunately doing today in some instances, for outmoded or unneeded skills, and, affirmatively, to steer our efforts in the right direction on a time basis.

2. To this end, there should be established a national clearinghouse for the classification of these skills and their needs on a geographic basis. At present, a limited amount

of work is being done in this area by the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the U.S. Employment Service. But these agencies overlap a good deal, and their operations do not synchronize well with large segments of private activity bearing on the subject.

3. The clearinghouse system should aim to present, on a timely and coordinated basis, all relevant public and private information, bearing mainly on skill requirements in relation to existing and near-term supplies of trained manpower. This information should be suitably classified as to all levels of remuneration by skill categories, length of retraining periods for typical upgrading situations, and the like. Coordination with vocational and other educational institutions would be necessary in order that the various interrelated activities be reflected in the clearinghouse's reports and analyses.

4. Such information, moreover, should be systematically used by the country's Armed Forces, especially in connection with their work in vocational guidance, since these services occupy a strategic position in relation to job escalation and career planning for many young people.

5. The clearinghouse system and cooperative work by many local groups in connection with it should play a constructive role also in education. The point is worth stressing, since the country's increasing emphasis on rapid technological improvement has vast implications for educational policy.

6. Primarily, we should pay relatively less attention to old-fashioned narrow training, and place more emphasis in the schools on fundamental subjects. For it is the basic subjects which provide the future working population with a strong springboard to sound skill in youth plus improvement and occupational flexibility after they have entered the labor force. Much of this is known, of course. What a skill clearinghouse system could do in particular would be to create a framework within which citizens could more actively cooperate with school authorities in weeding out obsolete courses and programs and in helping to expedite the upgrading of teachers.

A clearinghouse system could also exert pressure on behalf of school administrators who now might lack strong local support for reforms. For instance, in a great number of vocational schools, or the vocational departments of regular schools, students needing discipline are dumped into, say, the machine shop course. This simply disrupts the course, and class effectiveness suffers badly as a result. Why should disciplinary requirements and methods curtail necessary skill development?

7. At the college level, including both the 2-year junior college and the regular undergraduate institutions, upgrading of curriculums and instruction also seems to be necessary in many cases if the Nation is to achieve a maximum pace of job escalation in technical and professional work. College officials, to be sure, are doing more than before in an effort to improve effectiveness. A functioning skill clearinghouse system could constructively enhance their work.

#### STRENGTHENING COLLEGES

Especially worthy of study and close attention is the tendency to lengthen college programs in many States, ostensibly to improve the student product. Educational history shows that the usual result is little more than course proliferation, with many low-quality offerings remaining in curriculums instead of being displaced by more substantial and useful ones. With a good clearinghouse system, responsible local pressure can be brought to bear in support of those educators who are fighting within their institutions for stronger courses that genuinely challenge students coming from improved high schools. This work is important and by its nature needs to be done chiefly at the local level.

Today's needs for well-educated people are such that a college degree is equivalent in importance, and general need and availability, to the high school diploma of only a generation or so ago.

The significance is well illustrated in a study prepared by Prof. Almarin Phillips of the University of Virginia. He estimates that no less than 40 percent of the increase in our total national production is associated with technological change. Professor Phillips adds significantly that this change is now more rapid, but not materially different from change in previous periods. The problems developed not so much from the changes as from the failure of business, labor, and government to recognize them at their outset, when merely marginal corrections will suffice to keep skills and needs in step.

#### THE LOCAL IMPERATIVE

Such corrections, it should be emphasized, can be most effectively made, first of all, at the community level. The measure of their effectiveness, in fact, might well be the degree to which they prevent problems from ascending the scale of complexity to the regional, State, or Federal levels.

Where better, for instance, to spot and prepare solutions for technological changes than at the level of the community in which the changes first begin to affect individual employees and managements? Community educational institutions can be and must be more sensitive to such changes. Management, as it plans ahead, should be a partner in such community efforts—never excluded from them. The responsibility goes two ways, of course. Management must not exclude itself.

For the community that fails in its response to these challenges, preferring to pass the buck to higher, distant levels of government, there is an obvious and terrible fate: dependency, loss of local pride and initiative, and, eventually, loss of citizens and a slow decline to blight.

There are five broad areas in which action should be taken on the Federal level to remove impediments to job escalation in the private sector of the economy.

#### TAX REVISION

As might be expected, revision of our tax laws must play an important part in this effort. As a member of the tax-writing Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, I am acutely aware of the importance of tax policy for an effective nationwide program of job escalation. It has been said with much truth that our tax laws are now all but blind on these matters.

The five areas for action, with my specific recommendations in each area, are as follows:

1. Tax laws, for instance, provide no personal incentive for individuals contemplating retraining. Cases are covered in our newspapers constantly showing how tax laws impede the very upgrading process that our country so badly needs to encourage. Note the following press account:

"An Army captain got leave from his post as an artillery instructor to complete courses in psychology, public administration, and history. Under an Army plan to encourage higher education of its personnel, he continued to draw his regular pay, but he had to pay the added school expenses himself. The Internal Revenue Service, asked if the captain could deduct these outlays as an educational expense, said no. The law permits a deduction for costs of improving one's skills in an existing job, but not for those incurred to qualify for a new post."

Clearly, this shows that our tax laws work precisely to impede—not help—job escalation. Many individuals who want to improve their position know that they have to qualify for a different job to get a better one. The tax laws should reflect this elementary fact of life. Tax deductions or credits should be

given to men and women who want to train for greater skill or competence.

2. Another way in which our tax laws hinder employment is the area of geographic labor mobility. The tax laws were written when only a relatively small percentage of our people owned their own homes, and when few persons sought work far beyond reasonable commuting distance from their normal place of residence. Today, however, it makes no sense to have our tax laws continue to regard a man's legal residence for tax purposes as the place where he works, for today nearly 70 percent of our people own their own homes and are not going to pull up family stakes just to enable the breadwinner to accept a challenging, but perhaps temporary job 200 miles away. Why should shortages of skills exist in sections of our country when men are prepared to work there temporarily if they are not penalized taxwise? The acceptance of such employment should not require that the workers relocate their entire family near the jobsite in such cases.

#### NEEDED: REALISM

A realistic program for job escalation, therefore, would call for more realistic tax regulations defining "place of residence" as the "tax home" of those workers temporarily engaged in an occupation in another part of the country.

Together, these two tax reforms could do much directly to stimulate the more rapid skill development and job mobility that is necessary for the smooth performance of our dynamic economy.

3. The Nation's unemployment insurance system also has a great potential as a vehicle for promoting the upgrading of our labor force. This system is paid for by private employers but administered by the States, with some participation by the Federal Government. It has achieved fairly good results in terms of providing stopgap financial assistance to men out of work, tiding them over the cyclical downswings. But little has been made of the system with respect to the challenge of upgrading the skills of the labor force.

There is a simple key to the needed reform of our unemployment compensation system as far as job escalation is concerned. It is found by answering this question: How is an unemployed person treated at present if he enrolls in a training school to learn a new or better skill? The answer is that he is removed from the unemployment rolls, and thus becomes ineligible for unemployment insurance benefits, in 40 of the 50 States.

This is precisely the opposite of the policy that is called for. An unemployed person should be removed from the unemployment rolls if he cannot get a job in his obsolete skill and he refuses to start learning a skill that is in demand.

State legislation, therefore, should permit those engaged in training and retraining programs to continue to receive unemployment benefits up to normal amounts and limits, as is currently the case in only 18 of our 50 States and the District of Columbia.

#### EMPLOYER BENEFITS

Moreover, there is a potential for job escalation in the broadening of merit rating in unemployment payments. The cost of unemployment insurance to individual employers varies with the employment record of the firm. In other words, companies experiencing heavy unemployment pay more than those with a record of little unemployment.

There is no incentive stemming directly from the operation of the unemployment insurance system to provide retraining for unemployed personnel. An unemployed worker who may be undergoing company-sponsored retraining is still classified as unemployed, and the firm's merit-rating suffers accordingly. Surely this makes little



sense in view of the great need for increasing retraining opportunities.

States should broaden merit rating concepts to include on-the-job retraining, to the end that the employer is not penalized for extending this opportunity to his workers. This would be another step in the direction of rapid job escalation.

4. In our rapidly growing economy, machinery becomes obsolete before it wears out. This is the reality of our technological advancement. Do our tax laws reflect this reality? Not at all. We find, on an examination of the situation, that our tax laws are geared to the old economics of wear, not of obsolescence. Such tax machinery simply does not mesh with modern industrial requirements.

In spite of the long-needed recent revision of depreciation schedules, the problem remains. We do not yet know whether these new schedules will be responsive to the needs of the economy. Depreciation schedules must be kept up-to-date continually to reflect the economic reality of useful life.

It takes more investment money to buy machinery when it becomes obsolescent long before it wears out. For the sake of progress, therefore, one would think that our tax laws would encourage such investment. Yet cutting off such investment is precisely what our tax laws do. The lag in depreciation allowances is now estimated to be some \$4 to \$6 billion behind replacement needs. Our economic progress is obviously slowed down when a third of our industrial plant is obsolete, as it is today.

Our tax laws must permit more realistic depreciation allowances. We need this not only for the sake of more and better jobs in the United States, but also to keep the American economy competitive internationally and to impart strength to the dollar as a world currency. Today, for example, Britain allows more than 40 percent depreciation on new machinery in the year of acquisition. Germany permits a writeoff of 25 percent the first year and about 58 percent of the cost in the first 3 years. France does even better. We do only a fraction as well.

#### DEPRECIATION MODERNIZATION

There are four overriding reasons why we must modernize tax legislation bearing on depreciation. First, we will experience an increase in the annual additions to our labor force in the next decade. Some 3 million new workers will be wanting productive jobs. Second, the investment cost per job—the amount required to create a new position—is rising, and is now between \$20,000 and \$25,000 per man. Third, there is a high investment cost in generating new products. Sensational as it is in fact, the pace of new product development is little known. Actually, about 30 percent of the goods on the market today were not there only 5 years ago. Finally, our tax legislation respecting depreciation needs modernization to assure that the American economy remains up to date as compared with rival trading nations, especially in Europe.

The needed tax legislation should be in the form of generally applicable rates, known in advance to business management so that it can make the right kind of long-range investment plans. A system lodging discretionary authority with the Government adjusting depreciation rates or tax credits in terms of untested theoretical considerations—such as President Kennedy proposed shortly after assuming office—simply will not do the job.

5. Sound employment legislation also demands a well-ordered operation in the Congress of the United States. At present, this is lacking. There is overlapping jurisdiction among congressional committees dealing with employment. Consider, for example, the way the subject of automation is handled in the House of Representatives. It is

dealt with by the Education and Labor Committee, the Banking and Currency Committee, the Ways and Means Committee, and the Joint Economic Committee. Knowledge remains uncoordinated, and one committee usually acts without knowing very much about the experience of the other committees.

In this connection, I welcome the endorsement of the House Republican policy committee, for my proposal to establish a new coordinating committee. This would be a standing Committee on Employment, composed of members from each of the four committees mentioned in the preceding paragraph. Such a standing committee could recommend positive policies in the area of employment, cooperate with State legislatures and city councils throughout the country, and analyze executive branch activities in the economic field.

#### FULL EMPLOYMENT

With faith in ourselves, and perseverance in job escalation without federalization, we can succeed in attaining a future of full employment. We can do so while strengthening our freedom, not through decisions which trickle down from an apex of authority in Washington but from actions originating in the broad base of the pyramid of America's economic and political strength—in the heart and soul of a strong and free people.

[From Roll Call, Oct. 3, 1962]

#### HORSE-AND-BUGGY ECONOMICS A DRAG ON EMPLOYMENT PROGRESS

(Representative TOM CURTIS, "Eighty-seven Million Jobs—A Dynamic Program To End Unemployment," New York; Duell, Sloan & Pearce, 1962. \$1.95. Reviewed by Hon. PRESCOTT BUSH, U.S. Senator from Connecticut, ranking minority member of the Joint Economic Committee)

Congressman THOMAS B. CURTIS has written a thought-provoking and penetrating book about a subject close to the hearts of all Americans—their jobs.

A Missouri Republican from St. Louis County, Congressman CURTIS is well-equipped for the task by reason of his keen and searching intelligence and his long experience as the senior House member of the Joint Economic Committee, on which we serve together, as well as a ranking member of the House Ways and Means Committee.

The book appears at a particularly appropriate time. Unemployment, which so far during 1962 has not fallen below 5.4 percent of the civilian labor force, actually rose sharply in August to 5.8 percent. Particularly disturbing is the fact that this increase occurred at or near the top of the business cycle. Since the end of World War II, each recession has left us with a higher level of unemployment. Clearly, we are a long way from solving our unemployment problem.

Congressman CURTIS offers a fresh and penetrating analysis of how to eliminate this persistent, hard-core unemployment. He rejects the widely and often uncritically held dogma that we can do it by creating jobs for the unemployed through more and more Federal Government spending. Indeed, instead of finding a solution in Federal spending and "depression economics," CURTIS believes these nostrums aggravate and prolong our unemployment problem.

The central point of Congressman CURTIS' book is that in order to eliminate unemployment we must wake up to the fact that we are living in a dynamic and changing economy in which as many jobs, both actual and potential, are going begging as there are people out of work. He sees the solution to the unemployment problem in a shift of emphasis and attention from self-defeating attempts to increase the demand for obsolete skills to the urgent and more rewarding task of filling our job vacancies.

In a dynamic economy, characterized by swift technological advances, Congressman CURTIS points out that jobs are constantly being eliminated. But while jobs are being eliminated, new jobs are opening up. He offers striking evidence of this in the shift in employment in recent years from production to service-type, professional, managerial and highly skilled jobs.

Congressman CURTIS makes clear that this trend is certain to continue in the future. If we ignore it or if we seek to correct unemployment through the application of horse-and-buggy economics, we run the grave risk of holding back our economic growth and progress. When the Government seeks to create jobs artificially at skill levels that are no longer in demand, it hampers efforts to find a genuine and lasting solution. Congressman CURTIS points out that unfilled jobs hold back our economic growth as much as unemployment.

Our inability to fill our job vacancies and to put our unemployed workers back on the job is not, Congressman CURTIS believes, because of inadequate demand in the economy. Rather, it is caused by dislocations in the labor market. Very frequently, the unemployed person either does not have the skills to fill the job vacancies or he does not live in, or is not willing to move to, an area where jobs are available.

Congressman CURTIS persuasively argues for a vast national public and private program to upgrade the skills, training, and education of our people so they can meet the job needs of our modern society. As envisioned by Congressman CURTIS, persons high up on the skill ladder move into the new and demanding jobs and thus open up positions which can be filled by persons below them on the skill ladder, and so on down the line. He also advocates measures which would encourage greater worker mobility as well as increase inducements to save and invest, which are essential if we are to accumulate the capital required to create jobs.

In recent years the search for a solution to the problem of unemployment has resembled a cat chasing its own tail—a lot of action but no real progress. Congressman CURTIS, who probably more than any other man in Congress has devoted his time and thought to this problem, is due our thanks for introducing a new and penetrating outlook to what had become a stale and unrewarding search for an answer to the serious human problem of unemployment.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Globe-Democrat, Sept. 29-30, 1962]

#### CURTIS CALLS FOR FRESH LOOK AT UNEMPLOYMENT

(Reviewed by Patrick J. Buchanan. "Eighty-seven Million Jobs" by Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS (Duell, Sloan & Pearce))

Today as thousands of coalhaulers and ditchdiggers are unemployed, newspapers advertise for operators of coal-diggers and trenchers. As millions of Americans sit idle, millions of skilled jobs go begging.

The Federal Government is using antiquated solutions bred by depression unemployed to solve the postwar problem of technological change. Taxpayers' dollars for public works are keeping drudgery and unskilled labor feasible as a way of life.

This is the Congressman's thesis and he occupies the dugout with that team of economists which argues that increased investment capital—not the hiking of aggregate demand by Federal handouts—is the key to full employment. If left alone, the dynamic American economy will create new jobs as it makes the old ones obsolete.

With tax incentives, Government should induce local business and schools to retrain workers for the skilled jobs that are opening, should reward plant modernization, and grant the newly qualified laborer

easy access to areas where his talents can be employed.

Today the Government taxes every worker to provide a few with artificially created jobs, rather than encouraging the upgrading of skills to enable them to take on better jobs with a real future. Government seeks to bury the ugly visage of unemployment in a landslide of dollars that unearths the equally repulsive ogre of inflation.

To Mr. CURTIS, this is our crime against the future and a hoodwinking of workers, using Federal boodle to buy their votes and keep them toiling in fruitless vineyards.

Congressman CURTIS calls for a fresh look at unemployment and urges a single congressional study committee and a modern evaluation as election nears.

Chief shortcoming in the piece is his tendency to shortchange and oversimplify the arguments of a formidable economic school of thought entrenched in Swamp Poodle and Foggy Bottom.

Not a bulging text of charts and graphs, but a commonsense study by a principal actor who has stepped offstage to watch the huge cast of players, who, for all their eloquent soliloquies, seem to be moving to a curtain call that will find every American a ward of the state and an apostle of the status quo.

If today's notions prevailed years ago, he argues, men would be working on "cat whiskers" for crystal sets.

Cogent and clear, the work sides with that minority that steadfastly refuses to burn incense at the altar of John Maynard Keynes.

Opposition is anticipated from Washington deskmen and union leaders whose own future is tied to keeping telegraphers, farmers, and coal miners tapping obsolete keyboards, producing grain for Government bins, and loading 16 tons.

But these voices are familiar to Mr. CURTIS.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Sept. 28, 1962]

#### CURTIS BOOK DENIES ECONOMY UNWOUND (By Juan Cameron)

Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS is a dogged biter of Kennedy's economic thinking on the House-Senate Joint Economic Committee on which he serves as a senior Republican.

However, this influential Missourian also feels frustrated that his views—and those of other Republicans—are largely ignored by the press and public in the Democratic citadel.

The St. Louis lawyer—whose questions to administration economic policymakers have been linked to the quills of an aroused porcupine—has resorted to narrative now to present his lively if minority views on the Nation's No. 1 economic problem—unemployment.

His forum is a short, fresh little book, "87 Million Jobs—A Dynamic Program," published Friday (Duell, Sloan & Pearce, 129 pages, \$1.95).

#### VIEW REJECTED

Mr. CURTIS states that with unemployment high today and with some 13,500,000 new jobs to be found in the 1970's, this problem needs a more critical analysis than it has received.

His basic analysis brings out that high employment is not, as the Democrats maintain, evidence of a rundown economy—but rather a reflection of a dynamic one causing widespread dislocations in its wake.

(Indeed he argues that the unemployment figures used by the Federal Government present a mirage, not the actual unemployment situation existing.)

His main conclusion from this analysis is that the Government must stop treating unemployment problems as a matter of eco-

nomics geriatrics, with the prescribed remedy to be found in massive spending.

Since the jobless are a byproduct of growth, he argues, retraining, greater labor mobility, and more education are the ways out of this persistent problem.

#### WANT ADS HINT NEED

How can it be thought, Mr. CURTIS asks, that unemployment reflects economic stagnation when, as the jobless rate hovers around 5.5 percent, the want ads of newspapers indicate tens of thousands of jobs are going begging?

How can the administration analysis be that an economy which in 20 years has doubled its payrolls and in 10 has doubled its productive output, requires vast infusions of Federal money to keep it moving ahead?

Part of the answer for the administration's error, Mr. CURTIS argues, is that it misreads the unemployment statistics, which are confusing—a verdict that a Presidential study committee is expected to agree with in part in a report due this weekend.

#### INADEQUACIES NOTED

Mr. CURTIS and economists like Arthur F. Burns point out some inadequacies of present unemployment totals: The figures include youths 14 years and older who are not at work; people who say they are looking for work but who, it is suspected, are not; laid-off workers who do not work because they are waiting for old jobs to reopen; people who do not seek work because of ill health or because they believe no jobs are available.

The inclusion of such categories in the monthly unemployment totals "perpetuates the confusion of the (unemployment) numbers games," Mr. CURTIS contends.

The main reason there is so much long-term unemployment is that frictional unemployment—that caused by changing job demands in industry—has been left unsolved, Mr. CURTIS concludes.

#### OVERSIMPLIFICATION?

Many feel that Mr. CURTIS oversimplifies the cause and nature of unemployment and fails to give enough weight to many indicators which show that the American economy, absolutely and comparatively, is not expanding rapidly enough.

However, none disagree with his suggestions that more emphasis must be put on retraining, less on the dole.

He is correct in emphasizing, too, that while there is less need for ditchdiggers there is more for computer operators, lab technicians, garage mechanics, and natural scientists.

His criticism of unemployment statistics, too, is widely recognized, although how to correct the defects is not clear.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Sept. 28, 1962]

#### LACK OF SKILLS IS HELD KEY TO UNEMPLOYMENT PROBLEM

"The crux of the so-called unemployment problem is not the lack of jobs, but the lack of skills to fill available jobs."

This is the thesis on which Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, Republican, of Missouri, has written "87 Million Jobs," a book published today by Duell, Sloan & Pearce.

The title alludes to the fact that by 1970 the American labor force will number 87 million. The subtitle, "A Dynamic Program To End Unemployment," serves to introduce Congressman CURTIS' plan for upgrading the work force to fill the higher skilled jobs which he says are going begging today.

His multidimensional plan calls for a nationwide survey of the skills of the future and a national clearinghouse to classify these job opportunities and to disseminate information about them to schools and private employers.

On the Federal level, Representative CURTIS wants the unemployment insurance system revamped to give benefits to unemployed workers who train for new skills and deny benefits to those who refuse to start learning a new skill. He also wants tax regulations relaxed to encourage persons to upgrade their skills or to move to areas where employment is available.

Rather than spend Federal money to "create jobs to fit available skills," the Government should encourage private business to expand and thereby produce more jobs by granting "more realistic" and more up-to-date depreciation allowances, the Congressman contends.

[From the Washington Daily News, Sept. 28, 1962]

#### CURTIS OUTLINES JOB PLAN (By Robert Dietsch)

A leading Republican Congressman today outlined a program to upgrade unskilled and semiskilled workers to enable them to fill "the millions of jobs going begging in America today."

In a 126-page book, Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Missouri, suggests new tax devices, a national clearinghouse to report on job needs, wider training in schools, better training programs by employers and changes in the Federal unemployment insurance system.

But his accent is always on upgrading workers through private channels.

"I do not rule out Government which—at all levels—has an important role to play in a well-designed program of job escalation," Representative CURTIS writes in his book, "87 Million Jobs; A Dynamic Program."

"But Government spending, pump priming, does not equip a single man with the skills required to take one of the many new jobs created by our advancing technology. It can buy time, but only individual training or retraining can 'buy' any real guarantee of real work and real income."

At another point, Representative CURTIS—a member of the Ways and Means and the Joint Economic Committees—said, "We hear little about the important successes in job upgrading being scored by individual business firms \* \* \* not all of them can do as well as International Business Machines, which retrains 100,000 workers each year."

"But a number of companies are doing a fairly good job and could do much more under appropriate tax incentives and other Government policies."

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Sept. 29, 1962]

#### PEOPLE AT WORK—JOBS: TOO MANY SQUARE PEGS?

(By Ed Townsend)

NEW YORK.—"We have a serious problem on our hands. We have jobs going begging and we have people unemployed who would like to work."

Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS of Missouri, senior Republican in the House and a member of the House-Senate Joint Economic Committee and of the House Ways and Means Committee, makes this statement in a book, "Eighty-seven Million Jobs," published this past week by Duell, Sloan & Pearce—the result of 2 years of late evening consideration of a national problem that could become a national crisis.

The book is provocative; it will be debated widely in the weeks ahead. What it outlines as "a constructive solution to unemployment" will find support in some quarters, will be scoffed at or challenged in others. Nevertheless, the book is important. It focuses new and needed attention on the basis of problems too often considered only in terms of statistics.



Unemployment persists at a level of about 5 percent of the civilian labor force. Methods of counting the jobless differ. Unions contend that the Government's figures are too conservative—that if allowances are made for those working only part time, the number idle would be about 6 million and the percentage around 7 percent. Whichever is right, there is almost universal agreement that the total is much too high.

Moreover, long-term unemployment—the kind that really hurts—has been increasing steadily in recent years. Today there are more than 500,000 men or women who have been jobless more than 26 weeks and nearly 1 million who have been off jobs for more than 15 weeks.

Conservatively, there is a large pool of nearly 4 million men and women anxious to go to work, according to Mr. CURTIS, while hundreds of thousands of jobs remain unfilled because properly trained workers cannot be found.

The problem, he says, is one of imbalances. "Many employers, knowing the workers they need are not available do not even bother to advertise for them," Mr. CURTIS said in a recent discussion of the problem. The openings are for skilled workers, usually for specialists. The jobseekers—the unemployed in today's labor market—are largely unskilled or semiskilled.

For instance, 900,000 more persons could be employed in the field of health services alone if they were available, according to Mr. CURTIS. Many parts of the country are desperately short of teachers and other school personnel. In many cities, it is almost impossible to find competent, fully qualified secretaries.

Moreover, according to a survey by the Missouri Congressman, there is a severe shortage of automobile mechanics, tailors, sales clerks, shoe repairers, office workers, social and welfare workers, scientific and technical workers, and other classifications of white-collar and subprofessional workers—shortages that can be found even in areas with long and persistent unemployment.

However, a jobless coal miner or steelworker cannot be fitted easily into any of the shortage jobs. Usually, they lack the basic education and background necessary for retraining. Too often, they are not adaptable. And many of them are reluctant about making a new start in an entirely different field of employment.

"Too many people simply don't want to train for the jobs that are available," Mr. CURTIS comments, adding, "There is no magic cure-all for all problems, but \* \* \* we must launch a vast program to upgrade the skills of our people so that they can fill the many new jobs being created in our highly developed and increasingly service-oriented society and leave their old jobs to be filled by others, perhaps today's unemployed with their lesser skills."

This would mean training and retraining programs on a greatly expanded basis—and with attention to developing needs. There is entirely too much stress now on training and vocational programs directed toward skills little needed now or becoming obsolete, says Mr. CURTIS. There is entirely too much thinking in terms of today or the past, too little in the new and challenging terms of tomorrow, he adds.

"The technique of matching idle workers with unfilled jobs is in its infancy. So, too, is our system of training and retraining Americans to fill the jobs that must be filled in the future if as a nation we are to realize our economic potential," Representative CURTIS states.

The need is for a broad reshuffling, to upgrade workers "energetic and ambitious enough to try to improve skills or education." Today's big waste is the underdeveloped worker. Today's wrong technique is to try to train the untrainable—or to pass over

him as untrainable. The answer, as Mr. CURTIS sees it, is not to try to retrain the possessor of the lowest skill for newly emerging skilled jobs but to engage in a sweeping retraining program, upgrading workers all along the line.

It's not an easy program. It takes considerable cooperation all along the line, from workers and their unions, companies, and governments at all levels. It's only part of a solution. But it's a step that can be taken in a "free enterprise approach to our problems," according to the Congressman.

#### A GEOGRAPHER LOOKS AT CONNECTICUT HISTORY

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, on May 21, 1962, Mr. Joseph B. Hoyt presented a paper before the New Haven Colony Historical Society, which is most worthwhile. I ask unanimous consent that the paper be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the paper was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### A GEOGRAPHER LOOKS AT CONNECTICUT HISTORY

(A paper presented to the New Haven Colony Historical Society by Joseph B. Hoyt, May 21, 1962)

The geographer who embarks upon the task of writing history brings to that task a somewhat unique point of view. It is a point of view derived from his preoccupation with space relationships. If I may simplify things a bit to make my point: In considering the details in the tapestry of history, the historian thinks first of who and when. In contrast the geographer thinks first of where. Both are interested in explaining the why and how, but the historian tends to emphasize personal and time factors, while the geographer concentrates upon space factors.

Using Connecticut's history to illustrate these concepts, no historian would describe the settlement of our State without bringing in the names of John Oldham, Roger Ludlow, and Thomas Hooker. (Here in New Haven it might be more polite to refer to John Davenport and Theophilus Eaton.) In both cases the historian would unquestionably include the dates 1634, 1635, and 1636 in the settlement of the Connecticut Colony, and 1637-38 in the case of New Haven. Names and dates are facts of intrinsic importance for the historians. The more detailed histories of the settlement of the State also bring in the precise locations of the settlements, but as facts of secondary importance. Less detailed studies refer to them only under their present names without attempting to explain their locations.

The historical geographer describing the same events is concerned primarily with why these specific locations were settled first. To him the location is the most important fact while the names of the leaders and the dates of the settlements are of secondary importance. (The leaders' names aid him in separating one group from another should he wish to compare the several settlements. The dates are of value primarily when he wishes to relate later events to them. As the years pass, they become even less important. The debate on whether Hartford was settled in 1635 by the advance guard of Hooker's group, or in 1636 when the main body arrived, is a tempest in a teapot to the geographer.)

To the geographer the most significant facts in the first settlements of our State are (1) the selection of the alluvial meadows of the middle Connecticut River Valley, and (2) the selection of the best harbor on Long Island Sound as the locations for the earliest townships. These two choices tell us quite

a bit about these first settlers, their similarities and their differences. Both groups had to be concerned with locating good farmland since they had to support themselves from food they produced, but the New Haven Colony was settled by men who were also thinking in terms of commercial development, and, to them, the harbor was the most important asset of the New Haven area. It also had good farmland. [Today this is entirely built over by the city.]

The geographer adds a concern for the character of the land to his concern for space factors. In trying to account for the location of an event he turns first to a study of the physical characteristics of the location. Returning to our settlement illustration the geographer wants to know why the first settlements of the Connecticut Colony (I am distinguishing here between the New Haven and the Connecticut colonies) were located so far up the river. Why didn't John Oldham and the others locate in Haddam or in Lyme or part of Saybrook?

The explanation is clear to any resident of the lower Connecticut River, but it must have puzzled people back in Massachusetts if they had tried to plot the location of these first settlements. The historians pass over this puzzle or answer it somewhat cryptically by saying that the Hartford region had better land. They do not address themselves to the question of why the land was better. No geographer can content himself with such an answer. He must know why the land was better for farming in the Hartford region. It is not a natural situation. Normally as rivers approach the sea their valleys become broader, the flood plain wider and more extensive, and their value for farming settlements increases. This was obviously not true of the Connecticut River. Except for the fort at Saybrook, the early settlers avoided the lower Connecticut. And the Saybrook settlement was not chosen because of its agricultural land resources but because it guarded the entrance to the river.

To explain this rather unusual situation we need to look at the character of the land. Here we must turn to the geological history of the State. Many thousands of years back in our past a block of land crossing the State from north to south broke away and dropped down several hundreds or thousands of feet. Into this rift valley erosion poured millions of tons of sedimentary materials which the rivers stripped off the higher lands that lay on either side. The sands and clays deposited in this central strip of territory eventually hardened into rock (sandstones and shales). Both were softer than the granites and other crystalline rocks of the uplands. In a later stage of erosion the river, the predecessor to the present Connecticut, carved out a broad gentle valley, a flat bottomed valley covered with alluvial materials, excellent farmland. The lower portion of the Connecticut, from just south of the city of Middletown to the sea, crosses the old (hard rocks) upland. Here the valley is a narrow, V-shaped trough with virtually no flood plain at all. The towns are on the upland, which is a rolling, sloping surface; much of it even today remains under a forest cover.

The decision by the early settlers to bypass this rugged hilly region and to proceed upriver to the flatland around Hartford is part of what the geographer calls man-land relations. These might be considered the heart of a historical geographic study. The relationship between man and the land is a symbiotic one. Each of the two affects and is affected by the other. Man uses the resources of his land in making his living and is influenced by the relative abundance or scarcity of these resources in how he lives. In turn he changes the land as he lives on it. Some of the resources he uses up or destroys, others he improves by his actions. He cuts here and fills there. He reroutes

brooks and rivers, dredges harbors, levels hills, digs tunnels beneath the surface. The manmade landscape is a vastly different thing from the natural one. Neither the land nor the population is the same after a period of long continued contact. We are somewhat different from our ancestors who first arrived in Connecticut, and it is very obvious that the State has been changed.

Recognition of the significance of the physical environment in the way man develops a region is not determinism. Like other students of man, the geographer realizes that man has some freedom of choice although this freedom is not complete. Man is limited by his own knowledge, by his possession or lack of possession of certain technical skills, those that are necessary to utilize the various resources. As an example, calling again on Connecticut's early history, both Indians and whites lived in the lower Quinnipiac River Valley, and bog iron ores were present during both occupancies. Only the whites, however, possessed the knowledge and skill needed to use them.

This case, the bog iron ores, shows the second limitation on man's freedom of choice. Obviously if the bog iron had been absent, there would have been no early iron industry in New Haven. Thus to the cultural limitation must be added a geographical limitation, the existence of the resources. These must be present before man can use them. Their presence, of course, does not insure their use.

Few parts of the world are so poor that they offer man only one resource that he can use to support himself; most land areas offer several, a variety of vegetation, animal life, soils, minerals, water, or location. Some men are sufficiently versatile that they can use these resources in a number of ways, but most men are more limited in their skills. The colonists who came to Connecticut came looking for one resource, but it was not always the same one. Some were farmers seeking potentially good farmland. This they found in the middle Connecticut River Valley. Others were lumbermen seeking merchantable trees; later on some men began looking for ores; still others were merchants seeking a harbor. The first two settlements were made by men planning on trade with the Indians; these were the Dutch trading post at Hartford and the Plymouth one at the mouth of the Farmington in Windsor. Both of these groups of men selected their sites from the point of view of a location convenient for trade. The existence of farm land nearby was a secondary consideration and not particularly important. They would have been content to have imported food if their location had turned out to be suitable for trading but not for farming.

The man-land relationship is a complex thing. It is not a mathematical relationship, rather it resembles a chemical combination of several variables which may produce any one of a number of different economies. There is an almost infinite variety of geographic regions. Each is a compound of various vegetation types, soil types, land-forms types, and climate types, to say nothing of possible mineral and location factors. Blending with this geographic variety is another variable, man with his many different cultures. Whereas it might be safe to predict that a group of people accustomed to fish for a living who settled in a region with good fishing resources would continue to fish, one can never be sure. Fishing might be inhibited by some factor; a war and hostile ships offshore; fish might be declared taboo as food for some reason; or the discovery of gold in the interior might draw all the residents to the gold diggings.

The geographer is no more in the business of prophecy than is the historian. Both the historical geographer and the historian are in the business of explaining what has happened and why. I believe that the geographer adds a new dimension to the job.

The product of the historical geographer differs from the product of the historian in several ways. The historian is interested in personalities. The great man concept of history came from the historians; it could never have come from the historical geographers. He (the geographer) is concerned with the group. The fact that A led the group rather than B is of relatively minor significance. If John Davenport and Thomas Hooker had never existed I doubt that the settlement of their respective colonies would have been delayed a year. Both men left the impress of their personalities on their respective colonies and, had they not existed, the two settlements might have developed a little differently. Not very differently; both men reflected the general thinking of their times and of their associates. The historical geographer doesn't deny the significance of personalities, but he is not particularly concerned with the fact that the personality belonged to a man named Davenport rather than a man named Brown. If you wish, he writes a more impersonal kind of history.

The historical geographer looks for patterns of occupation (the way people are distributed around the region) and for changes in that pattern. In my own study of Connecticut I was fascinated by the way settlement spread throughout the State. Knowing the character of Connecticut's land and the way the early settlers thought about land, the patterns of spreading settlement were perfectly understandable. First the central Connecticut River valley and the coastline; then men moved slowly up the smaller river valleys from the coast and east and west from the Connecticut River itself. The higher uplands on the east and west were the last to be settled.

The hard rocks of these uplands had prevented the creation of broad river valleys and the first settlements there were located on the uplands. Along the Massachusetts border these uplands were quite high and somewhat cooler and less valuable for agriculture. The towns with the most rugged topography and the highest elevations were settled last and never developed into prosperous agricultural communities, Norfolk, Colebrook, Union, Washington. As you travel across these uplands you will note the tendency has been to clear the relatively flat-topped hills and to leave the slopes and many of the narrower valleys in forest. The explanation here lies back in the geologic past, also.

By the date of the first national census a pattern of occupation, based upon a subsistence agriculture for the most part, had fully developed. The Connecticut population was distributed around the State in close agreement with the ability of the land to support people by this type of economy. There was quite an even distribution with somewhat more people in the towns in the central valley, that had better agricultural resources, and along the coast where many settlers supported themselves by activities associated with the sea. The slightly denser pattern that appears in towns like New Haven, and along the coast toward New York may be partly explained by another type of agricultural operation that had begun to develop. This was a commercialized farming, raising food products that were sold in New York, or were shipped further afield. Not only were farms smaller and more productive and they supported a denser agricultural population, in addition there were those who lived by trading or craft activities in the towns. Such a map should be titled "A Map Showing the Agricultural Evaluation of the State."

A second pattern of occupation began to emerge in the first decades of the 19th century. It was the result of the mating of the industrial revolution and the Connecticut land. The industrial revolution has been variously defined. Here I would suggest

that it was a cultural change producing new ways of thinking about manufacturing, particularly the idea of applying power to the several manufacturing processes of the textile industry. Waterpower had been used since the first days of the colony in grinding grain, or in sawing wood. By the middle of the eighteenth century it was being used in fulling mills. Toward the end of the century textile machinery had been set up in Rhode Island, Massachusetts and Connecticut and the whole process of spinning and weaving became mechanized using water power.

These new ideas came to Connecticut as a second wind comes to a runner. The rate of population growth in Connecticut had begun to slow down. In the decade 1780-90 we had been growing at a rate of 17 percent for the 10-year period, but from 1790 to 1800 and for each successive decade to 1840 the rate of increase ranged between 4 and 8 percent. Obviously by 1800 the State was supporting about as many people as it could on a largely subsistence agricultural basis. The surplus population was moving north and west to the open frontier lands. (The migration was made up, as they all were, of two groups: (1) The young, ambitious, energetic people who wanted more scope for their talents than they felt the old hometown offered to them. Some of these were younger children of a family that did not have enough land to support them all. Most families were large in those days and the average farm of 100 to 200 acres could only support one family. As the children grew up most of them would have to migrate. (2) The second group was made up of the failures, the ne'er-do-wells, for whom the grass is always greener beyond the horizon.)

Many of our hill towns reached their peak populations in the 1790 census and were actually declining in population in the first decades of the 19th century. Land was being abandoned and was reverting to forest. Lack of knowledge or bad judgment on the part of some farmers had resulted in clearing of hillsides that should never have been cleared. These poorer lands, scrub farms, were the first to be abandoned completely when the West opened up. Often the farms had never amounted to much, a few acres of corn and hay, a scrawny cow or two, and a tumbledown log cabin or two-room shack. They represented a sort of rural slum of the 18th century. We have our modern equivalents, the tar paper shacks on back roads.

We desperately needed new ideas in 1800. The State averaged 50 people on every square mile of our land. The quality of the land varies from town to town and is rarely all usable for agriculture. The system followed in 1800 could be called a form of shifting cultivation. Land was cleared, planted to corn for a few years, then turned over to grass cultivation and pasture for an equal length of time. Then corn or another grain was tried again. If, in the course of cultivating, the land proved poorer than had been anticipated, it was left in grass and became pasture land often growing up to bush pasture. By 1800 40 percent of the State had been cleared, but 679,000 acres or 43 percent of the cleared land was classed as bush pasture and was in the process of reverting to forest. Only the development of a new resource could make up for our limited land resources and permit further growth of the State's population.

The new resource came to light with the new ideas mentioned earlier. It was the waterpower of the State. The earlier gristmills and sawmills had often only run 1 or 2 days a week, or were turned on only when a customer appeared with his sack of grain or logs. They didn't need a large head of water or expensive storage facilities. If the stream ran low in summer, the mill suspended operation for a month or two. Few of the larger streams were used for such



small-scale mill operations. The new factories created a demand for larger scale waterpower developments and focused attention on unused waterpower sites. Timothy Dwight noted the effect of these new needs when he commented on how rapidly stream-side land values rose in the Quinebaug valley around 1800.

Connecticut possessed the very desirable combination of physical features that fitted the developing manufacturing complex. These were:

1. A reliable year-round rainfall and relatively moderate winter temperatures.
2. A hilly topography that produced rapidly flowing streams, numerous falls, and thus desirable mill sites.
3. Many ponds and lakes, left as a legacy by the glacier; these could be made into storage reservoirs to even out the seasonal fluctuations in riverflow.
4. A mechanically adept population that had exhausted other State resources and was eager to try a new type of work.
5. Sufficient capital accumulated by years of thrifty Yankee saving and from profits from seafaring. This capital was seeking an opportunity for investment.

These last two are cultural elements that blended with the physical elements.

Historians have nicknamed us the "land of steady habits" and have implied we have a rather cautious approach to new ideas. The changeover did not come overnight. But, by 1850, the shift had been accomplished. We had become a manufacturing State. A new pattern of occupancy emerged, one that would characterize the State almost up to the present day. The hill towns that were dependent on agriculture continued to lose population as they had been doing ever since 1790. Most of these towns had had dreams of manufacturing in the early years of the century and had begun small mills and factories. Their hopes were dashed by the small scale of the water powers in their towns. Success in the very competitive manufacturing of this period depended, among other things, upon a substantial power source. In the larger valleys, Naugatuck and Quinebaug, the newly developing mill towns absorbed the surplus rural population in addition to the immigrants who began to arrive in Connecticut in large numbers after 1840. The decade 1840-50 found Connecticut for the first time in 50 years really increasing in population, 20 percent for the 10-year period.

The shifting population pattern shows up quite clearly in a map of population changes, 1800 to 1850. In this map a simple divide has been made between towns with a larger population in 1850 than they had in 1800 and those with fewer people at the later date. Generally the towns shown in black are the smaller hill towns which lacked water power; the towns in white, and thus showing a population increase, are river towns.

Each of the main valleys from the Housatonic on the west to the Quinebaug in the east showed the pattern of increasing population in this half century. In the Housatonic the iron industry from Kent north to Salisbury and Canaan was the main factor. Along the Naugatuck were rising the manufacturing towns of Winsted, Torrington, Waterbury, Naugatuck, Seymour, Ansonia, and Derby. The Quinnipiac Valley boasted such busy little manufacturing centers as Plainville, Southington, Meriden, and Wallingford. On the Connecticut itself Windsor Locks had begun to emerge and across the river in Enfield were large carpet factories. The Hockanum supported the Rockville and Manchester industries. Further east each of the tributaries to the Thames, Hopbrook, Willimantic, and Quinebaug, rivers turned dozens of water wheels that powered an expanding textile industry.

This was the start of the urban movement in Connecticut that became more intensi-

fied in the second half of the century. In the six decades, 1840-1900, the people of the State shifted from agriculture to manufacturing as the base for their economy. To do so they had to shift their places of residence from the country to the cities. Between 1850 and 1900 was an even more widespread movement of people in the State. A number of upland and small coastal communities that had succeeded in maintaining their populations in the earlier half century now joined the list of declining towns. With hardly an exception the pattern of industrial distribution that had developed by 1900 remains unchanged today. It has become intensified. The largest cities of that date remain the largest today although their relative rank has changed.

It would be both inaccurate and unfair to suggest that this development was inevitable. The existence of potential waterpower sites in a town did not create the manufacturing plants that were located on those sites. However, given the Connecticut population of this period, the numerous men seeking locations for factories of many kinds, it might have been expected that the potentials that did exist would be found and used. The personality factor was very important. Every industry in our State, and every town, can point to specific individuals whose ability was largely responsible for that town's growth. Some of their names are familiar to us all. It was the genius of such men as Eli Whitney, the Collins brothers, Elisha Root, Samuel Colt, Eli Terry, Seth Thomas, Chauncey Jerome, Linus Yale, Charles Goodyear, Albert Pope and many others that directed our manufacturing towns into the specialties which have made many of them world famous. They gave direction and impetus to a movement that had started before most of them were born.

While we recognize the contribution of these leaders in manufacturing we should not forget the part played by thousands of other Connecticut workers, now nameless, who so capably followed these leaders. Had the population of Connecticut been uniformly stupid and incapable we could never have become a manufacturing State. And, had we lacked the physical resources that the early manufacturing industries were based upon, specifically waterpower, we would even now be a small farming State.

Today we are superimposing a third pattern of occupancy upon the two previous patterns. Each pattern of occupancy develops from a valuation of the State by men who have a specific frame of reference. (For example, the first pattern evolved as farmers viewed the State from the point of view of its value for farming. The regions they settled first and most completely were the best farmlands. Thus the pattern of occupancy, the distribution of people, reflected the distribution of good land. The second pattern developed as the result of a valuation that focused upon an entirely different resource and one that was located in areas that had not been attractive to the farmers, water powers in narrow river valleys. It did not entirely replace the pattern of farming occupancy. Indeed, during the first three quarters of the 19th century the acreage used for agriculture increased for the State as a whole. Farming was, however, concentrated increasingly upon the best land.)

The third pattern developed as a result of our population reexamining the State with new ideas in mind, in a new frame of reference. Now they began to evaluate the State from the point of view of its residential use. In the two earlier periods people selected residential sites primarily because they were near their work. In the 20th century one major invention, the automobile, freed people from the necessity of locating near their jobs. This personal transportation device made it possible for them to select a home-site on the basis of other factors, the ameni-

ties if they desired. A second invention, this one a cultural invention, the concept of vacations from work, awakened us to certain amenities, certain attractions, which the Connecticut landscape possesses and which few Connecticut residents had appreciated in the earlier years of our history. Both of these inventions were 19th century, although the full impact did not come until the end of the second decade of the 20th century.

The cultural invention preceded the mechanical one. In the latter part of the 19th century urban families had begun to come back to the hill and shore towns of New England which they or their parents had deserted to move to the cities. At first they came only for a brief visit at the old homestead or in a nearby farmhouse willing to take summer visitors. Gradually their stay lengthened until many families were spending the entire summer. They bought up abandoned farms, lake and sea front property and hillside locations. Summer months along the seashore or in our hill towns awakened an appreciation for these areas of our State that had become depopulated. Comparing the amenities of country living with the increasing disadvantages of city life, many of these people decided to stay on as permanent residents. Others returned to the city determined somehow to combine the two. This created our suburban movement.

The suburban movement may be considered a backwash from the urban migration of the 19th century. By 1920 urban growth had begun to slow down and the suburbs began to grow. This countryward movement resembled the ripples sent out by a rock dropped into a forest pool. Near the center it involved many people, further out the numbers were smaller. At first people moved into the towns closest to the cities where they worked. Very few moved more than one town away. The ideal of a home near one's work was stubbornly held. Today the migration is in full swing and the more accessible towns of Fairfield, New Haven, and Litchfield counties are filling up with people.

Every town in Fairfield County except Bridgeport, Danbury, Shelton, and Sherman increased over 100 percent in the four decades 1920-1960. The larger cities, Greenwich, Stamford, and Norwalk, increased, however, more slowly than the clearly suburban communities. Growth in these suburbs ranged from 150 percent in Bethel and Redding to 670 percent in Trumbull. New Haven County showed the same pattern. The industrial centers of the Naugatuck River grew very slowly; in reality they did not hold their natural increase. Their residents began moving to the surrounding suburbs. Four towns increased over 500 percent and the two little upland communities of Prospect and Wolcott increased 1,130 and 1,570 percent respectively. Elsewhere in the State a similar growth pattern developed. Hartford, like New Haven, was surrounded by expanding suburbs.

Litchfield, Tolland, Windham, and New London Counties shared least in this growth pattern. They were too far away from the industrial centers that employed most of the suburban residents. But even here growth was evident. Most towns in these counties were declining hill towns until 1920—now they began to reverse the trend. In the past four decades every one grew although the growth was a modest 40 to 50 percent on the average. The last decade provided most of this growth for them. Declining textile industries in the Quinebaug Valley produced a setback for such communities as Putnam, Thompson, Killingly, Plainfield, and even Norwich. New industries in the past decade have begun slowly to replace the departed textile mills and this section may recover in the next decade.

Distance still plays a role in determining the rate of growth. The more remote towns

have increased the least. Commuting 20 miles each way doesn't bother many people, but few are willing to commute 40 miles. (All of us know exceptions to this general rule, and some train commuters to New York come from as far away as New Haven.)

The decentralization of industry has aided this dispersal. The invention of the steam engine and more recently the electric motor have freed industry from the necessity of locating by a river. Now a factory may be built wherever its owner wishes. In the past two decades we have seen new factories built in communities that years ago had given up hope of becoming manufacturing cities since they lacked water power. The Electric Boat Co. in Groton, and the Sikorsky plant in Stratford are examples. These two towns have displaced such well-known cities as Meriden and Norwich in the top 10 manufacturing cities of the State.

Today the urban movement has actually reversed itself in the case of the largest cities. In Connecticut, Hartford, Bridgeport and New Haven have fewer residents today than they had in 1950. This process has been going on for some time but has been concealed by the fact that we have considered any addition to the population of the previous decade in a city as evidence of growth. (We sometimes qualified it, stating it was a very small growth.) In reality a city should grow by natural increase, excess of births over deaths for the decade, say a minimum of 10 percent for the census period. If it does not it is because the residents are leaving the city. New Haven succeeded in concealing its loss of population in the 1940-50 period by counting some 8,000 Yale students for the first time. We showed a gain of 3,800 persons; in reality the city lost 20,000 people. [Computed: 160,605 in 1940, a natural increase of 10 percent would have added 16,000 plus 8,000 Yale students—24,000 or estimated total of 184,000; we had 164,443] The actual departure of people in the 1950-60 period produced a total of 152,000, an apparent loss of 12,000, but a real loss of 28,000. These are the people who have filled up our suburbs and small towns.

Each of these three patterns of population distribution as shown on the maps show man-land relations, how men with differing goals have reacted to Connecticut's varied resources at different periods of our history. Such studies are the contribution of the geographer.

Applying the same technique, the analysis of historical events in their spatial and locational aspects, the geographer contributes to an understanding of other aspects of our history. The transportation history of our State—railroads, roads, canals, navigable streams, is a natural field of study for a geographer. One can map the State's railroads by its rivers, or its rivers by its railroad lines. They coincide beautifully.

The relationship between transportation routes and the growth of towns along the route is clearly shown in the case of the Farmington Canal and the establishment and growth of such communities as Milldale, Plainville, Avon, Westogue, and Mechanicsville. The failure of towns to develop a rail connection was partly responsible for the decline of several small towns in upland regions of the State.

The entire railroad history of Connecticut must be studied in relation to the physical geography of the State. Taking an impartial point of view in regard to the present railroad situation, one has to recognize that we overbuilt railroads in this State. The railroad offered such real advantages over canal transportation and the poor road system that this building boom is understandable. Today even newer methods of transportation are presenting the railroads with the same sort of dilemma that they presented to the canal. If Messrs. Farnham and Sheffield, who built the canal, were alive to-

day they might regard the railroad plight as a sort of just retribution.

In closing I should simply like to say that I hope I have helped you see that there are chapters in our history to which a geographic point of view brings enlightenment. Both points of view, that of the historian with his concern for when and who and of the geographer with an emphasis upon the why and where, are essential to an understanding of our past. I myself came to geography through the anteroom of history. I hope that more historians in the future will linger in the halls of geography before they pass on into what someone has called the ivory towers in which most professors are supposed to dwell. Thank you.

#### AT LAST—HOLLYWOOD STRIKES BACK AGAINST COMMUNISM

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, as one who has tried for long years to do his share in the war we must constantly wage against the bloodthirsty international Communist conspiracy, I wish to express appreciation for an unusual blow now being struck in that struggle, on motion picture screens throughout America.

I have reference to a film, "We'll Bury You," which traces with shocking authenticity communism's master plan for world conquest, patiently, step by step, but always with the truth that comes from history itself.

An American film company, Columbia Pictures, has given us "We'll Bury You," a picture that has nothing to do with fiction, but rather represents the painstaking selection of scene after unforgettable scene from the brutal record. Some of this material has never been shown before; much of it comes from private sources, through the archives of our own Library of Congress and the U.S. Army. The newsreel companies, and the Associated Press, have also made a valiant, inestimable contribution.

The producers went to no casting office or talent agency for their characters. They went to history, and obtained as infamous a collection of scoundrels as has ever been assembled for a film:

Khrushchev, Castro, Stalin, Trotsky, Mao Tse-tung, Lenin, Malenkov, and Mikoyan, and others of this foul stripe are among those appearing in this historic film.

Of course, their victims, millions of them innocents, also play their own tragic role in this most revolting story of our time.

"We'll Bury You" is an admirable film because it does not stop with vituperation and bombast, as too many persons and groups do. It presents facts, and shuns vague generalities. I know I speak for millions of my fellow Americans whom I urge to fortify themselves with knowledge while they share the inherent excitement of this story of our enemy, the Red terror which seeks the death of our most precious institutions, if not our life itself.

Patriotic organizations, fraternal groups, church clubs, and good Americans in general can rejoice over the fact that Columbia Pictures has produced this long-awaited counterattack against communism. It is important that the youth of America as well as adult citizens everywhere be given an opportunity to

see and hear the truth about the Communist conspiracy as portrayed in "We'll Bury You." If alert citizens of every community will now take steps to be sure their favorite local theater books and shows this remarkable film the widespread favorable reaction to a portrayal of this type should stimulate other Hollywood producers and other film companies to come up with equally effective dramatic or historical portrayals evidencing the true dimensions of the Communist menace and the nature of the conspiracy whose leader proudly boasted in a rare moment of arrogant frankness, "We'll Bury You."

#### RICHARDSON FOUNDATION FELLOWS

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, before this session is drawn to a close I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate the contribution which the Richardson Foundation of Greensboro, N.C., has made to the work of the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee, of which I am chairman.

During the past year the foundation, with the approval of the subcommittee, assigned two young lawyers to work with the subcommittee staff. These young men, George Autry and George Ragsdale were graduated in June 1961 from the law schools of Duke University and the University of North Carolina, respectively. They joined the subcommittee staff in August of 1961 and worked there through June of this year. During that time, they made a fine contribution to the subcommittee work. They assisted in the comprehensive research of the subcommittee on such subjects as "The Constitutional Rights of the American Indian," "Administration of Criminal Justice," "The Constitutional Rights of Military Personnel," "Literacy Tests and Voter Requirements in Federal and State Elections," and contributed in innumerable ways to the subcommittee's operation.

I feel that I would be remiss if I were not to extend to the Richardson Foundation and to the Richardson Foundation fellows, Messrs. Autry and Ragsdale, the subcommittee's deep appreciation for the fine contribution these young men have made to our work during this Congress.

At the conclusion of their foundation assignment, Mr. Ragsdale returned to his home in Raleigh, N.C., where he is currently engaged in private practice. Mr. Autry has remained with the subcommittee and is a valuable member of our staff. Earlier this year, an article appeared in the Winston-Salem Journal concerning Mr. Autry and his lovely young wife who is a member of the staff of our distinguished deputy majority leader. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### NORTH CAROLINA MAN, WIFE AIDS TO SENATORS

WASHINGTON.—The first time George B. Autry met Bess Powell they talked. Bess talked better and won \$250.

That was 8 years ago when they participated in a speech contest in Wilmington,



N.C. George represented New Hanover High School and Bess spoke for Chestnut Junior High.

George finally got his hands on the money when he married Bess and now their talk is centered around politics which fills both their lives as aids to Senators.

George Autry, 24, is a staff member of the Senate Constitutional Rights Subcommittee, whose chairman is Senator SAM J. ERVIN Jr., Democrat of North Carolina.

Autry is serving with ERVIN under a 1-year Richardson Foundation fellowship, given to three law school graduates in North Carolina every year. George won the fellowship while attending Duke University.

#### LEGISLATIVE ASSISTANT

Bess Autry is a legislative assistant to Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat of Minnesota. Bess, like her husband, a Duke graduate, applied for an opening in HUMPHREY's office and got it.

George's main task is to prepare the subcommittee for the hearings on the controversial administration proposal to outlaw literacy requirements more stringent than a sixth-grade education, as a prerequisite to voting in Federal elections.

"We're doing legal research on both sides of the question," Autry said. "There's a real question whether the bill is constitutional or not."

"I love it," Autry said of his job. "I have always been interested in constitutional law and this is a perfect opportunity to do more research on the subject."

Mrs. Autry, 22, spends her working hours answering letters from constituents, researching on HUMPHREY's statements, and working with out-of-State queries.

Both spend some time helping their Senators with speeches.

#### NO CONFLICT

ERVIN, a conservative, and HUMPHREY, considered a leading Senate liberal, differ on many legislative items but the Autrys don't carry the conflict home.

"We talk politics constantly," Bess said "but we see pretty much eye to eye—we feel they are both great Senators."

George agrees and said, "I think we can avoid any domestic problems."

The Autrys' social life, since their arrival in August, has centered around parties given by people in their offices. They have a one-bedroom apartment near the Capitol.

Autry said the biggest difference living in Wilmington and Washington "is the traffic."

Despite their enjoyment of Washington life, George and Bess want to return to North Carolina next year. But they haven't decided if it will be Wilmington or somewhere else in the State.

George wants to practice law and keep active in Democratic party politics, but has no plans to run for public office. Bess wants to raise a family.

#### LUTHER HODGES—HE LIVES THE AMERICAN DREAM

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, among the distinguished progeny of North Carolina have been many men who have contributed selflessly to our Nation through service in the Federal Government. One of these highly dedicated public servants is, I am certain, destined to occupy a particularly outstanding place in the history of our country.

Born in a humble log cabin, he was a man of diligence and ambition. Not having the funds to complete his high school education, this man set out on his own to achieve not only a high school, but also a college degree. This he managed to do through hard and diligent

work for the necessary financial requirements.

Later, a grassroots start in the textile industry acted as the springboard to the vice presidency of Marshall Field Co., and still later to West Germany as Chief of the Economic Cooperation Administration, managing the Industry Division. After achieving his place as a world leader in business and industry, he began a new career in the public service. Entering North Carolina politics in 1952, he ran successfully for Lieutenant Governor and in 1954 became Governor. In this capacity he became known throughout the world for the industry he brought to our State; he made North Carolina even better known for the abundance of resources she offers to anyone or any company seeking a new home.

This man, one of the most prominent in America today, is Luther Hodges, of whom it can be truly said, has lived the "American dream." President Kennedy acknowledged Hodges' contributions by appointing him Secretary of Commerce in the New Frontier. He has proved worthy of the President's confidence during the past 2 years as head of that great Department. The innovations he has made and the leadership he has given have received the almost unanimous approbation of the businessmen and economists of America.

To pay tribute to this great American and outstanding statesman, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article which appeared earlier this year in the Family Weekly, "Luther Hodges—He Lives the American Dream."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### LUTHER HODGES—HE LIVES THE AMERICAN DREAM

(By Flora Rheta Schreiber)

From a log cabin on a tobacco farm, this genial extrovert has gone on to success in business, politics, government—and family life.

In 1914, the 16-year-old son of a tenant farmer began his career selling newspapers, magazines, candy, and popcorn on the main-line trains between Roanoke and Norfolk, Va.

Going east on train No. 4 as far as Suffolk, he would catch No. 3 to return to Roanoke. "I prayed," he recalls, "that just once we would miss connections with No. 3 at Suffolk so I could go on to Norfolk and see both a large city and the ocean. I had never seen either."

One day this dream was fulfilled. Arriving in Norfolk at night, he was permitted a day's layover in the city. Sleeping in a 25-cent flophouse room with a dozen other persons, he clutched the railway's money bags for fear they would be snatched from him. When day came, he wandered about the city, took a long look at the ocean, and dreamed of worlds beyond.

This boy, who today is Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges, not only dreamed but acted. It would be hard to find a sharper exemplification of the American dream, of an ascent from rags to riches, from obscurity to eminence.

Secretary Hodges was born March 9, 1898, in a log cabin in the red-clay country of Virginia, the eighth of nine children.

The shack was on a tobacco farm where his parents were tenants. When he was 2, the crops failed and the family moved to the North Carolina mill town of Leaksville. His

mother, a tender, gentle woman, died when he was 11. His father, living a life of hardship, was himself harsh and unbending. The boy's life was one of great stress. "We never even celebrated Christmas," Luther Hodges told me.

In the Reverend P. H. Gwynn, a Presbyterian minister, he found a friend who saw his value and gave him encouragement. So intense was the boy's affinity for his mentor, a classics scholar, that the boy made straight A's in Greek and Latin. "This boy will some day be Governor of the State," the Reverend Mr. Gwynn predicted.

Luther's father, however, opposed his son's going to college. None of his brothers had—why should he? When he was 16, Luther did not have funds to complete high school, but he was determined to get a job, raise money, then continue his education. At the invitation of his sister, Mrs. S. F. Crews, wife of a railroad brakeman, he went to live with her in Roanoke, where he landed the job as a candy butcher.

Hodges worked his way through high school, then the University of North Carolina. He waited tables, fired furnaces, ran a clothes-pressing club, sold Bibles door to door, and worked in a textile plant. Despite all this, he made the basketball team, managed the baseball team, and was elected president of both the student council and the senior class. He was voted best all-around man on campus.

He also found time to go courting. He met the lady of his dreams in the spring of 1919. Though Luther was just a senior, the Reverend Mr. Gwynn had arranged for him to deliver the commencement address at the Leaksville High School. On the platform with him was the lady—Martha Blakeney, a teacher.

"I saw a pretty brown-haired girl dressed in organdy," he recalls, "I had to have a date with her. And, I did."

"Oh, Luther Hodges is all right," Martha Blakeney told a friend, "but he's not the kind of man I'd marry." When he did ask her to marry him, her answer was: "I love you very much, but I've had a hard time, and I won't marry a man who earns under \$3,000 a year."

"This came as a surprise but not a permanent setback," Hodges told me. "She had lost her mother early and had to struggle. Just the same, she cashed in everything she had for our wedding, June 24, 1922."

The Hodges have enjoyed a comfortable camaraderie. As E. L. Rankin, Jr., his press secretary for 6 years, puts it, "The Hodges are very frank with each other. He talks things over with her, she tells him what she thinks, he values her opinion—and makes up his own mind."

#### THE GREAT CAREER BEGINS

Hodges, who as a prospective bridegroom earned \$83 a month, rose steadily in the business world. He organized the first personnel department in the textile mills owned by Marshall Field & Co., and by 1943 he was a vice president of the company.

By 1950 he was earning more than \$75,000 a year, but he also was looking to new horizons. "Making money is the easiest thing men do," he told Gen. Capus Waynick, a friend.

"I told myself," he reminisces, "you're over 50. If you're going to do it, better do it now."

He resigned from Marshall Field, and the Hodges moved to West Germany, where he served as Chief of our Economic Cooperation Administration's industry division.

When a friend suggested he try politics in 1952, Hodges, a political novice, entered the fray to become a candidate for North Carolina's Lieutenant Governor, and won. Gov. William B. Umstead died 2 years later, and Hodges succeeded. He was 56.

On his first day in office, he faced a bank of pushbuttons on his desk in Raleigh.

"Partly for devilment and partly to find out what would happen. I began punching them," he recalls. "People started coming in from back offices and everywhere. I was brand new and didn't even know them. I said, 'What do you do, and why do you do it?' That was the basic approach, and it created interest—and consternation."

The main theme of Hodges' administration was increasing the industrial development of North Carolina through Operation Bootstrap. Big out-of-State industries were aggressively encouraged to set up branches in the State. Small businessmen got financial transfusions when the Governor created the Business Development Corp., with lending power of \$10 million to service industries needing special help.

In 1956, Hodges entered the race for a full 4-year term as Governor and won in a landslide. He served longer as Governor than any other man elected to that job.

It was just 9 years after Luther Hodges entered politics that he was invited to Palm Beach, where President-elect Kennedy announced his appointment as Secretary of Commerce. On the plane returning from Palm Beach, the 62-year-old, silver-haired dynamo sat deep in thought. His private secretary leaned over. "Has it sunk in yet?" he asked.

Hodges raised a hand. "Don't bother me," he replied. "I've already started working."

The Hodges now live in an apartment in Washington's Woodley Place. Their children are far from home, however. Nancy, 35, the wife of John C. Finlay, an oil executive, lives in New Delhi, India. Betsy, 36, is the wife of an oil company engineer and lives in Anacortes, Wash. Luther II, 25, is doing research in business administration at the University of North Carolina. The Hodges are proud grandparents of eight youngsters.

For all his family pride, Luther Hodges is not a demonstrative father or grandfather. "In general," say E. L. Rankin, "he is quite restrained. There are no outward displays of affection. He is sentimental, but his exterior doesn't show it. He's a very complicated man."

Hodges apparently applied his own early background to the rearing of his children.

"When my son was about 10," he says, "we came home after a year in Europe, where he had been getting an allowance. I told him then, 'Your allowance will be cut when you get back to America. You will have to earn your own spending money.'"

The Hodges are urbane and cosmopolitan. They enjoy good books and cherish their associations with playwright Paul Green of the Carolina Playmakers and with Carl Sandburg.

Mrs. Hodges, who is popular with the cabinet wives, sponsors her share of public events and used to entertain extensively. Yet essentially she is not a clubwoman or a joiner. Her deepest satisfactions are in reading, bridge (which she plays with tournament skill), history, and painting still life and landscapes.

The Secretary, on the other hand, is indefatigable in fishing and hunting. Says General Waynick, "When he pulls a trigger, something is likely to drop."

He is facile, too, with a quip. Asked by a reporter when the Business Ethics Advisory Council of the Commerce Department will complete the code it began last May, he said, "About January." Asked why the delay, he replied, "It's hard to write a new Ten Commandments."

A natural extrovert and optimist, Hodges has always been a joiner. Even while he was building his career, he was active in the Methodist Church and the YMCA. He organized classes for illiterate millworkers and for 10 years taught at night. Entering politics, he developed a showman's flare. When a magazine asked him to pose in his underwear, he genially complied. Martha

Hodges, more reserved than he, thought that this was too great a price for the Governor of North Carolina to pay.

#### EARLY TO BED AND EARLY TO RISE

Secretary Hodges is buoyantly youthful. He rises at 6 a.m., retires at 10 (at the latest, 10:30), even if there are guests. He says, "I just tell them, 'Excuse me, I'm going to bed.'" He eats lightly, and his favorite foods are white beans, turnip salad, and cornbread. He has kept his weight at 190 pounds, the same as it was when he was sworn in as Governor. He doesn't smoke, and drinks very moderately.

His twin fetishes are punctuality and speed. With his associates, he is demanding. His own tempo is so fast that he wants his staff to anticipate his thoughts. He writes notes to them before leaving home in the morning and arrives at his office at 8 or 8:15 with a brief case crammed with, "Klotz: What think?—" or "Ruder: See H." By 8:30 he expects an answer. After all, it is 2 hours since he thought of it.

When he loses patience, he is likely to apologize—though in an indirect way. "I've decided," he once told a secretary who had briefly fallen from grace, "that you and I shouldn't get mad at the same time."

#### THE ONLY WAY IS UP

Hodges assumed the post of Secretary of Commerce without illusions. He knew that for many years, in both Democratic and Republican administrations, the power of the Commerce Department had declined, that its single towering figure had been Herbert Hoover. To his new employees, he quipped: "The only way this Department can go is up."

Up is where he is trying to take it. As co-chairman of the important Advisory Committee on Labor-Management (the so-called wage-price committee), he has developed cordial relations with the Department of Labor, which had long been hostile to Commerce. Congress, at his request, has set up the U.S. Travel Service to stimulate tourism in the United States. The Department also has assumed broader powers, with responsibility for the President's depressed-area program and with its role in developing international trade.

Hodges' job also is to reassure businessmen that the President is not antibusiness. "I want the Department of Commerce to mean to the average businessman what the Department of Labor has come to mean to labor," the Secretary told me.

Luther Hodges believes firmly that the American dream that propelled him is still a great national resource, but one that citizens must not expect to have handed them as a dole.

"It is the search for security," he told me, "that keeps men from getting ahead. If they would stop thinking of punching the clock, work for the love of work, and not be afraid to make bold moves, there would be no stopping them."

Behind each word, one seems to hear the slogan Hodges has lived by: "It can be done."

#### THE PROBLEM OF PRESIDENTIAL INABILITY

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, yesterday's editorial section of the Washington Post carried a splendid article on Presidential inability by Richard H. Hansen. Now a practicing lawyer in Lincoln, Nebr., Mr. Hansen directed a 19-month study of the problem of "Disabled Presidents" which was published in the June 1961 Nebraska Law Review. This fall the University of Nebraska Press is publishing his book, "The Year We Had No President." It vividly portrays the history of the "Tyler Precedent" and the

problems which can arise by relying upon informal memorandums to overcome the ambiguity in the Constitution which has perplexed lawyers from the time President Tyler took office. It is my hope that the Congress will soon tackle this problem by enacting a constitutional amendment. I am confident that when it does, its work will be greatly aided by Mr. Hansen's authoritative study. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to insert the Post article at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### DISABLED PRESIDENT PROBLEM STILL NAGS

(By Richard H. Hansen)

"The heart attack, the ileitis operation, and the stroke were terribly difficult personal crises for President Eisenhower. But even more, they were potential constitutional crises of the greatest magnitude for the Nation," wrote Richard Nixon in "Six Crises."

These constitutional crises resulted from the failure of the Constitution to provide a method for determining Presidential disability, or to give Congress clear authority to set up a procedure.

President Kennedy wisely recognized the gap in the law when he made an agreement on the subject with Vice President JOHNSON. It is identical with that made between President Eisenhower and Vice President Nixon in 1958. Admittedly, it is a stopgap; the basic constitutional void still exists.

The Nebraska Law Review undertook an exhaustive study of Presidential disability in September 1960, under my direction. Our research lasted 19 months, and the results filled a book. What did the study reveal?

Three Attorneys General (Brownell, Rogers, and Kennedy) have pointed out that the proceedings of the Constitutional Convention and the history of the pre-Federal period clearly prove that it was never intended that the Vice President become President when the Chief Executive dies or is disabled. The Vice President is referred to in the Federalist Papers as a "substitute President."

If all of this is so clear, why have we had a year without a President (for that is a conservative estimate of the period of time when a President has been disabled and no one has acted in his stead)?

When President William Henry Harrison died in 1841, records of the Constitutional Convention and the pre-Federal age were scarce. Furthermore, Vice President Tyler was confronted by the intrigues of Henry Clay, who was determined to control the President. Clay implied that "Acting President" Tyler had less powers than the regularly elected Harrison.

Tyler, determined not to become another Clay pigeon, promptly asserted that he had become President on the death of Harrison. Thus he established the "Tyler precedent," which has been followed by six Vice Presidents when a President died.

This deviation from the original intent of the Constitution would be of theoretical interest only, but for the fact that it has been used to prevent the Vice President from acting as President in cases of disability. Garfield's case exemplifies what has happened.

President Garfield was shot July 2, 1880. He lingered between life and death until September 19. Although the only Presidential function he performed during those 90 days was the signing of an extradition paper, the Cabinet did not request Vice President Chester Arthur to act as President.

The Cabinet said it was because of the Tyler precedent: the fear that Garfield upon



recovery, would be barred from resuming his functions. The truth is that Arthur represented a fraction of the Republican Party hostile to Garfield's program.

Woodrow Wilson's Vice President, Thomas R. Marshall, was Wilson's second choice for the post. Wilson considered Marshall "a very small-caliber man." Consequently, when Wilson was stricken in September 1919, Marshall wasn't informed of the President's condition nor was he invited to act as President. Wilson's private secretary, Tumulty, gave the Tyler precedent as the reason.

Had Marshall become Acting President, the history of that critical period might have been different. As it is, Marshall's sole bulwark against oblivion is his comment that "what this country needs is a good 5-cent cigar."

A young Army captain, Dwight Eisenhower, watched the Wilson tragedy with alarm. When, as President, General Eisenhower was faced with the same constitutional dilemma, he entered into the memorandum agreement with Nixon setting out the conditions under which Nixon would temporarily act as President.

The agreement was never intended as a long-range solution. In fact, it was General Eisenhower who pointed out to me one of its most serious weaknesses. He emphasized the point several times in an interview at Gettysburg in June 1961.

"The whole strength of the agreement," he said, "depends upon good will between the President and Vice President." This being the case, the tenuous character of the memorandum can be seen from the Garfield and Wilson experiences.

A second weakness of the memorandum is that it does not remove the veil of secrecy which traditionally surrounds Presidential illnesses. Only a handful of people ever saw the originals of the Eisenhower-Nixon letter. The Kennedy-Johnson agreement is evidenced only by a White House news release.

Executive discretion still determines whether and how much the public and Cabinet know about Presidential illnesses. It is true that Presidential physicals have now become a custom, but because a President's doctor is still selected by the Chief Executive and is usually a personal friend, the public feeling is that the physician is under the President's control.

One of the least mentioned, but most serious, defects in the memorandum rests in its assumption that a President will step aside in favor of his Vice President—even if they are close friends. The human being would be rare indeed who would voluntarily relinquish the office of President—the center of power in the free world.

What is the answer to the problem of Presidential disability? An ideal solution will be found about the same time lawyers produce the reasonable man. Nevertheless, we must set out to find the answer with the fewest legal and practical objections, and this was the purpose of the Nebraska study.

The findings to date justify the following conclusions:

A constitutional amendment is necessary to remove all doubt about the power of Congress to legislate concerning this vital matter.

The Constitution says only that "Congress may by law provide for the case of removal, death, resignation, or inability, both of the President and Vice President, declaring what officer shall then act as President. These words have been interpreted in our succession laws to mean that Congress is empowered to provide for succession only in cases where both officers are disabled.

The amendment should be simple and in keeping with the flexibility that has made the Constitution lasting.

This means stating a few general principles and leaving implementation to Congress; with regard to disability, it means omitting

from the amendment the method (the "how," "when," and "by whom") for determining when a President is disabled. This would eliminate the biggest source of disagreement.

The amendment should include a simple statement differentiating between temporary and permanent disability.

It might be wise, to avoid any political implications, to provide also that the amendment would not become effective until the term of the President who takes office next following its approval.

#### INADMISSIBLE CONFESSIONS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point a very fine editorial entitled "Inadmissible Confessions," which appeared in today's issue of the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### INADMISSIBLE CONFESSIONS

"We necessarily concern ourselves with means, not alone with ends," Judge Charles Fahy wrote in the Killough case, decided by the court of appeals on Thursday. The decision upset the conviction of a man who, by his own admission, had strangled his wife to death. It upset the conviction because a majority of the court believed the admission had been obtained as a result of unlawful conduct by the police and was unwilling to let the administration of justice be corrupted by condoning such conduct. It is precisely for this purpose that courts sit under a Government of laws.

In the Mallory case of 1957, the Supreme Court held that a confession is inadmissible in Federal courts if obtained by violation of the law requiring that an arrested person be taken before a judicial officer as quickly as possible. The police here speedily developed a technique for getting around this rule. Having obtained an inadmissible confession and brought about a suspect's detention by means of it, they sought, usually with success, to persuade him to reaffirm the confession in jail; and they then used the reaffirmed confession to convict him.

It is hard to understand how this patent evasion of the Mallory rule could have been countenanced by any court. But the fact is that panels of the court of appeals allowed convictions obtained by this legerdemain to stand in two cases. In the Killough case the problem was presented for the first time to the full court of appeals. Five members of the court agreed that the conviction could not be allowed to stand without making a mockery of the Mallory rule. Judge Fahy wrote for himself and Judges Edgerton, Bazelon, and Washington:

"The oral confession obtained in this case at the jail so soon after the illegally procured and inadmissible confessions must be held inadmissible as the fruit of the latter. To admit it would, in substance and effect, admit the earlier confessions properly held inadmissible, and thus defeat the exclusionary rule. To hold otherwise would be in reality to permit an accused to be tried without counsel, jury, or court, alone with police at their headquarters or at jail. The public trial guaranteed by the Constitution, with counsel, jury, and court, after indictment, would be hardly more than a form for validation of what had already been accomplished invalidly."

Judge Skelly Wright, who filed a separate concurring opinion, would have gone further and overruled the earlier decisions allowing the use of reaffirmed confessions. To Judge Fahy's powerful argument, he added two compelling observations: "Pragmatically, it has been shown that exclusionary rules are the only effective deterrent to po-

lice wrongdoing \* \* \*. A fair trial means a trial based on evidence fairly obtained."

Judge Warren Burger wrote an extremely angry and consoling dissent, accusing the majority of "ignoring a reasonable balance between individual rights and protection of the public." But the simple truth is that there is no real difference between these two. The public is made up of individuals, and protection of the one is protection of the other. Judge Burger's dissent offers two suggestions, one useful in our view, the other most unfortunate.

He would "direct that the district court, in every case where evidence is suppressed because of an officer's violation of a statute or constitutional provision, send a copy of the transcript \* \* \* to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia." Perhaps this would lead to disciplinary measures. Better still, it might produce a program of education leading to better and more lawful law enforcement.

Judge Burger's suggestion that Congress adopt legislation to diminish the protections given to individuals by the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure seems to us, however, altogether unwise and injudicious. It comes close to encouraging arrests for investigation and police detention without judicial sanction. There has been quite enough talk of this sort of constitutional corner cutting of late from policemen without hearing it from appellate court judges.

Mr. MORSE. The editorial supports the decision of Judge Fahy, of the court of appeals, in regard to the admissibility of confessions obtained illegally under the Mallory doctrine.

There is a strong movement to try, through congressional action, to reverse the unanimous decision of the Supreme Court in the Mallory case, which was written by the incomparable Felix Frankfurter. The editorial deals with the Mallory decision. All the Mallory decision in effect provides is that if anyone is arrested by Federal officers, he shall be taken forthwith, without delay, before a committing magistrate.

What is wrong with that provision of the law? Why should the kind of police state power be given to police departments desired by, I am sad to report, the Washington, D.C., Police Department? The power to arrest for investigation violates fundamental principles of civil liberties in the United States.

I commend the editorial in this morning's Washington Post to the reading of Members of Congress, and I commend the reading of the scholarly decision of Judge Fahy to Members of Congress.

#### CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON BERLIN CRISIS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the majority leader.

On October 3, 1962, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and I submitted a concurrent resolution dealing with the Berlin crisis. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a story appearing in today's press calling attention to the fact that another person from West Berlin—a young man—has been shot and the Communist refused even to let a Red Cross ambulance go to his medical assistance, to say nothing about a West Berlin military ambulance.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**ALLIES CONFER IN BERLIN ON BARRED AMBULANCE**

BERLIN, October 7.—West Berlin's three allied military commands consulted throughout the day today on East Germany's refusal yesterday to admit Western ambulances on a mercy mission to East Berlin.

A British spokesman said American, British, and French headquarters were in constant consultation. East German border guards refused to let two ambulances, one a British army vehicle, come to the aid of a young West Berliner shot when caught helping East Berliners escape through a tunnel to West Berlin.

It was the first time the East German authorities have barred any allied military vehicle from entering the eastern sector.

Informed sources in West Berlin said they did not expect a protest to be filed with the Russians today.

Meanwhile, an 18-year-old East Berliner escaped to the West by jumping from the roof of an East Berlin apartment building to a West Berlin sidewalk, United Press International reported.

West Berlin police would not identify the refugee or give any details of how he had made his way into the apartment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, later today I shall move to lay aside whatever is the pending business at the time to take up the concurrent resolution relating to Berlin to which I have referred. I know of no reason why it should languish any longer in committee. The time for the Senate to act on the Berlin crisis, by way of agreeing to the proposed resolution, is now. The House acted last week. I hope that my majority leader will give consideration to the possibility of bringing up the concurrent resolution relating to Berlin before the day is over.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if I may be recognized in my own right, I should like to say in response that I would have to object automatically to such a procedure because the Committee on Foreign Relations is charged with the responsibility and, as much as I would dislike doing so, I would have no other choice.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I have made some inquiry. Perhaps with the passage of some hours that obstacle can be removed. But there is concern as to whether or not there is even a quorum of the Foreign Relations Committee available. The interests of the United States cannot wait until a quorum of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate is present.

**PENALTIES FOR THREATS AGAINST SUCCESSORS TO PRESIDENCY**

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 818, H.R. 6691.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 6691) to amend title 18, United States Code, secs. 871 and 3056, to provide penalties for threats against the successors to the Presidency, to authorize their

protection by the Secret Service, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 836), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**PURPOSE**

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to provide criminal penalties against those who threaten the Vice-President-elect, or such other officer as may be next in order of succession to the Office of President, and authorizes the Secret Service to provide full-time protection for the Vice President, the Vice-President-elect, and a former President for a reasonable period of time after he leaves office.

**STATEMENT**

The existing law governing threats against, and protection for, the person next in line to the Presidency applies only to the President-elect and the Vice President of the United States. It does not apply to the person next in line to the Presidency when a President has died and the Vice President has become President, or when some disability has resulted in the succession of the Vice President to the Presidency. Existing law does not make any provision for the protection of the Vice-President-elect between election day and the date he assumes office. Since it is the purpose of the law to provide protection for both the President and the person next in line to succeed him, it is necessary that this obvious gap in the existing statutes should be closed.

Section 1 of the bill would, therefore, include the Vice-President-elect and such other officer as may be next to the President in the order of the succession to the Presidency among those against whom it is a crime to make certain threats.

The final section of this legislation broadens the authority of the Secret Service to provide protection to the Vice President, the Vice-President-elect, and a former President.

Section 3056 of title 18, United States Code, now provides that the Secret Service is authorized to protect the person of the President of the United States, the members of his immediate family, the President-elect, and the Vice President. However, in the case of the Vice President, the Secret Service is authorized to provide protection only upon the request of that official. This legislation would eliminate the requirement that the Vice President request Secret Service protection as a condition precedent to the Secret Service providing it. In addition, the bill authorizes the Secret Service to provide protection to the Vice-President-elect.

This legislation would also authorize the Secret Service to provide protection to a former President at his request for a reasonable period after he leaves office. In testimony before a subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary, Mr. U. E. Baughman, then Chief of the Secret Service, stated that he contemplated this would require a detail of five or six agents for a period of 6 months after the President leaves office. This Secret Service protection would be provided only upon the request of the former President.

The committee is of the view that protection of the former President under this legislation is to be limited to the protection of the person of the former President and not of his property.

The Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. A. Gilmore Flues, stated in a letter to

the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, under date of May 15, 1961, that the cost of this legislation is limited to the expense of providing a full-time detail for the protection of the Vice President. Mr. Flues estimated that this would cost \$100,864.28 each year. Testimony before a subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary also indicated that the Secret Service would not seek additional funds in order to perform the duties imposed upon it under this legislation in relation to the past President and a Vice-President-elect. It was stated in that hearing that this cost would be absorbed in the normal Secret Service budget.

This legislation was recommended by the President of the United States, in identical letters to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate. The committee is in complete agreement with the President of the United States that these gaps in the present law should be closed, and accordingly, recommends favorable consideration of H.R. 6691, without amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which H.R. 6691 was passed.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

**ENABLING ACT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA**

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1980, Senate bill 3283.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3283) to amend the Enabling Act of the State of Arizona for the purpose of facilitating the sale or lease of certain lands granted to such State to local governments for use of public purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments on page 1, line 9, after "1910", to strike out "(36 Stat. 557)" and insert "(36 Stat. 557, 574-575)"; on page 2, line 5, after the word "confirmed", to insert "or any natural products thereof"; in line 10, after the word "advertising", to strike out "or competitive bidding"; in line 14, after the word "made.", to insert "The term 'public purposes' as used in this paragraph shall not include industrial park sites or other commercial purposes."; and after line 16, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. Consent is hereby given to the State of Arizona to adopt any amendment to the constitution of the State or to enact any laws necessary to carry out the purposes hereof.



So as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 28 of the Act entitled "An Act to enable the people of New Mexico to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; and to enable the people of Arizona to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States", approved June 20, 1910 (36 Stat. 557, 574-575), as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:*

"Nothing contained in this section shall prevent the transfer by sale or lease by the State of Arizona of any lands hereby granted or confirmed, or any natural products thereof to any agency of the State or to any county, city, or other local government or agency thereof, created by or pursuant to the laws of such State, for use for public purposes, without regard to the provisions of this section or other provisions of law requiring appraisal, advertising, or relating to the price at which such lands may be sold or leased, if such sale or lease is conditioned upon the continued use of the lands for the purpose for which the transfer is made. The term 'public purposes' as used in this paragraph shall not include industrial park sites or other commercial purposes."

Sec. 2. Consent is hereby given to the State of Arizona to adopt any amendment to the constitution of the State or to enact any laws necessary to carry out the purposes hereof.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the amendments were considered and agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### AMENDMENT OF THE POLICEMEN AND FIREMEN'S RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2233, H.R. 6836.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 6836) to amend the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 2271), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (H.R.

6836) to amend the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act, after full consideration report thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

The purpose of this bill is to amend existing law so as to create an additional category of service-connected disability which will enable policemen and firemen to retire if an injury or disease contracted other than exclusively in the performance of duty is so aggravated by the performance of duty as to disable the member from further duty.

A member retiring under this proposed legislation will receive the same annuity as if there was no doubt of the disability having resulted exclusively in the performance of duty. Such legislation is comparable to and in keeping with industrial compensation procedures.

The Fiscal Affairs Subcommittee of this committee held a hearing on H.R. 6836 on August 1, 1962, and received favorable testimony from representatives of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Fire Department, and the Police Department, as well as representatives of the Firemen's Association, and the Policemen's Association. At this time the subcommittee was informed that during the calendar years 1958, 1959, and 1960, the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Relief Board cleared 379 retirement cases, of which 292 were retirements for disability incurred in performance of duty, 23 were retirements for disability incurred not in the performance of duty, and 64 were optional retirements for age and service. Based on the experience over the preceding 3 years, it is anticipated that the future costs of this legislation will be minor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### 1ST LT. CHARLES M. COX, U.S. ARMY (RETIRED)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2244, Senate bill 1961.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1961) for the relief of 1st Lt. Charles M. Cox, U.S. Army (retired).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That First Lieutenant Charles M. Cox, United States Army (retired), of Buxton, Oregon, is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of \$6,800.58, representing the amount of overpayments of longevity pay received by him for the period from June 1, 1942, through March 13, 1960, while the said Lieutenant Charles M. Cox was serving as a member of the United States Army, such overpayments having been made as a result of his being erroneously*

credited, for pay purposes, with service performed in the organized militia of the State of New York.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said First Lieutenant Charles M. Cox, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the overpayments referred to in the first section of this Act.

#### FOREIGN AID AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1963—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13175) making appropriations for the foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of October 6, 1962, p. 22709, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement on the report.

I voted against the foreign-aid authorization bill when it was before the Senate because, in my judgment, it involved the waste of hundreds of millions of dollars. I argued then that we ought to try to change the ratio of loans to grants from the ratio provided in the bill of 65 cents out of every foreign dollar being grant money or giveaway money and only 35 cents out of every foreign aid dollar repayable loan money. I pointed out that 4 years ago I started the struggle in the Foreign Relations Committee to change that ratio. At that time the grant money in the foreign-aid bill was a little more than 90 cents out of every dollar. We made some progress in 4 years, but in my judgment, not enough. I pointed out also that there was a great deal of waste, as far as the American taxpayers were concerned, in a good many of the military items in the bill. We are paying an all-out-of-proportion share of the military cost of supporting freedom around the world. We are paying most of the cost in the South Vietnam defense of freedom. For years we have paid all the cost of Laos.

We are making heavy military contributions to such Asian countries as Thailand and Formosa. I asked the rhetorical question, After all, where is England? Where are Australia, New Zealand, the Philippines, Portugal, France, Italy, the Lowlands, Norway, and West Germany? Where are our allies? In view of the economic recovery of most of them, greatly aided by American taxpayer dollars, how long do they expect us to con-

tinue to pay an all-out-of-proportion share of the military costs for the defense of freedom around the world?

I made some comments, as the RECORD will show, about the great contribution we have made to NATO, the heavy expenditures that the American taxpayers have made to the NATO countries.

For the most part, these countries are now in a stronger economic position than they were prior to World War II. I now ask, as I asked then, how long do we expect the American taxpayers to assume this terrific cost, this pouring out of the hundreds of millions of dollars, without the savings to which the American people are entitled?

For years now, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin-American Affairs, I have protested the heavy expenditures for military equipment in Latin America. In a very real sense much has been contributed to them so that they could keep up with the Joneses, so to speak, for we know that much of the military equipment that we made available to Latin-American countries will not really be of any value to us in case of conflict with Russia. To the contrary, Latin-American countries will have to look to us for their protection, because such military equipment as we have made available to them for the most part is of no value to them in a nuclear war, for if we get into a war with Russia, it will not be a conventional war, but a nuclear war.

So I have raised such questions as: What justification is there for this military aid to Latin America? Is military aid strengthening freedom in Latin America? Will it increase democracy in Latin America, or is it true, as has frequently been the case, it is used to strengthen totalitarian regimes, and playing right into the hands of Communist propaganda in Latin America? I fear that the latter is the truth.

Much of the military aid to Latin America has not strengthened democracy. It has had the inverse effect of strengthening communism in Latin America.

I see on the floor the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], nodding his head in approval. He knows of what I speak.

Much of our expenditures in Latin America for military aid in recent years not only have not strengthened democracy, but have had the inverse effect of strengthening communism.

Too frequently our military equipment has been used in Latin America to keep down freedom rather than strengthening freedom. Too frequently our military aid in Latin America has been used to build up totalitarian regimes such as Batista's in Cuba. The Senate will recall that in January 1958 my subcommittee held hearings on military aid to Batista. We brought out in those hearings that Batista could not remain in power in Cuba were it not for American military aid. That was admitted by the Assistant Secretary for Latin American Affairs of the State Department under my cross-examination. I say to the everlasting credit of the State Department

that by the middle of March 1958 the State Department announced that no further military aid would go to Batista.

It is only now becoming public knowledge that aid was made available to Castro. I was one of those who hoped and believed at the beginning that Castro might bring Cuba a democratic regime. However, we soon discovered that he would not do that. I have an obligation to make clear to the American people what I believed to be the facts about Castro. I was the first, for a considerable time, in the Senate to speak out against the Castro regime. When he started with his blood baths, and when he placed under house arrest that first great President of Cuba under the Castro regime, President Urrutia, one of the great judges of Cuba, because he insisted upon the application of democratic procedures protecting the rights of Cuba, I knew we were seeing the substitution of one totalitarian for another, and that we would see the replacing of a Fascist totalitarian with a Communist totalitarian.

I shall always be proud of the fact that the RECORD shows that I was the first in the Senate to point out that in my opinion Castro was following the Commie line. In my first speech on this issue I said, "I do not know whether he is a Communist, but it does not make any difference, because the procedures he is following are Communist procedures."

We have much to answer for when the scholars, long after we have disappeared from the face of this earth, write the history of America's conduct in respect to expenditures for military arms in Latin America. So much of our expenditures in Latin America were used to play into the hands of totalitarian regimes.

So again this year I protested, as did the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], who made one of the scholarly speeches of this session of Congress when he presented his speech on the floor giving an analysis of American military aid over the years to Latin America, and deplored it, as I have long deplored.

I opposed the final authorization bill for foreign aid. I opposed the appropriation bill for foreign aid. I felt that at least in the Senate we should have eliminated a good many millions of dollars of waste in the appropriation bill. That we did not do. We ought to have tackled more forthrightly than we did the problem of loans versus grants.

I did not cast a popular vote when I voted against foreign aid. If anyone thinks I did, let him come to my office and read the mail that I have received on this subject. However, I cast a vote that I believe is right. Time will prove me right, because we cannot justify the waste that we have been guilty of in the foreign-aid bill.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] was very persuasive. The RECORD shows that I voted for amendment after amendment that the Senator from Louisiana offered. He brought out the millions of dollars in the pipeline with regard to military expenditures. He pointed out that we could have cut, much more drastically than the confer-

ence report cuts, the appropriations for military expenditures and still not weaken the security of the United States, but possibly teach our allies that the time has come for them to assume a greater obligation than they have thus far assumed.

There is no doubt that the conference report is a great improvement over the appropriation bill the Senate passed.

Mr. President, these savings are gratifying. However, in my judgment it is no longer a question of the dollar sign in the foreign aid bill. It is not a question of whether X money or Y money is saved. The problem about the foreign aid program is a matter of structure of the foreign aid bill, from the standpoint of the foreign policy involved in it. It has many weaknesses from the standpoint of its structures.

It has many weaknesses with respect to the question of loans versus grants. It has still many weaknesses with respect to the public policy as it affects the supply of military assistance to various totalitarian regimes throughout the world. It is an unsound public policy; and so far as the senior Senator from Oregon is concerned, the question as to whether the amount shall be X dollars or Y dollars for the support of a bad public policy is immaterial. We should come to grips with the question of the public policy which is involved.

The bill still contains glaring weaknesses with respect to the whole economic aid program as it affects public policy. Are we providing economic aid in the right places; and as a result of not providing aid in the right places, are we not still wasting millions of the taxpayers' dollars? I believe we are. Although as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations I favor good foreign aid programs, the bill, in my judgment, does not provide for the American people a good foreign aid program.

We must come to grips with the bad policies in the whole foreign aid program. If the bad policies in the foreign aid program are corrected, we shall have very little trouble in reaching agreement as to the amounts.

Because the bill is an appropriation bill and not a legislative bill, and deals with policy questions and continues to perpetuate an unsound foreign aid policy, I desire the RECORD to show that I also oppose the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the conference report is agreed to.

Mr. LAUSCHE subsequently said: Mr. President, when the foreign-aid bill was before the Senate, I made a statement setting forth my reasons for not being able to concur in what was recommended. This afternoon we have before us the appropriation bill adopted pursuant to that authorization. I do not concur in the action taken by the Senate in approving the conference report. The conference report, in a measure, improves the original bill, but not adequately to require my support of the measure. I want the record to show that I do not approve of what was done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair) laid before the Senate



a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 13175, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S.,  
October 8, 1962.

*Resolved*, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 19, 23, and 26 to the bill (H.R. 13175) entitled "An Act making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes," and concur therein.

*Resolved*, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted, insert the following:

"*Provided*, That no part of any other appropriation contained in this Act, except funds appropriated under this Act for the contingency fund (not to exceed \$10,000,000), may be used to augment funds or programs contained in this paragraph and no funds shall be transferred from funds appropriated under any other paragraph of title I of this Act to the contingency fund for the purpose of augmenting funds or programs contained in this paragraph."

*Resolved*, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendments, insert the following: "and amounts certified pursuant to section 1311 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955, as having been obligated against appropriations heretofore made under the authority of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, for the same general purpose as any of the subparagraphs under "Economic Assistance", are hereby continued available for the same period as the respective appropriations in such subparagraphs for the same general purpose: *Provided*, That such purpose relates to a project previously justified to Congress and the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate are notified prior to the reobligation of funds for such projects and no objection is entered by either Committee within 60 days of such notification."

*Resolved*, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"SEC. 107. (a) No assistance shall be furnished to any country which sells, furnishes, or permits any ships under its registry to carry to Cuba, so long as it is governed by the Castro regime, under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, any arms, ammunition, implements of war, atomic energy materials, or any articles, materials, or supplies, such as petroleum, transportation materials of strategic value, and items of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, contained on the list maintained by the Administrator pursuant to title I of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, as amended.

"(b) No economic assistance shall be furnished to any country which sells, furnishes, or permits any ships under its registry to carry items of economic assistance to Cuba so long as it is governed by the Castro regime, under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, unless the President determines that the withholding of such assistance would be contrary to the national inter-

est and reports such determination to the Foreign Relations and Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the Foreign Affairs and Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives. Reports made pursuant to this subsection shall be published in the Federal Register within seven days of submission to the committees and shall contain a statement by the President of the reasons for such determination."

*Resolved*, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"SEC. 109. (a) No assistance shall be furnished to any nation, whose government is based upon that theory of government known as communism under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, for any arms, ammunition, implements of war, atomic energy materials, or any articles, materials, or supplies, such as petroleum, transportation materials of strategic value, and items of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, contained on the list maintained by the Administrator pursuant to title I of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, as amended.

"(b) No economic assistance shall be furnished to any nation whose government is based upon that theory of government known as communism under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended (except section 215(b)), unless the President determines that the withholding of such assistance would be contrary to the national interest and reports such determination to the Foreign Affairs and Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives and Foreign Relations and Appropriations Committees of the Senate. Reports made pursuant to this subsection shall be published in the Federal Register within seven days of submission to the committees and shall contain a statement by the President of the reasons for such determination."

*Resolved*, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "approved the terms of the contracts and".

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 18, 20, 22, and 24.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

#### DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS, 1963

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not desire to discuss the motion of the Senator from Arizona. I wish to speak concerning another subject.

As a general rule, I have never deemed it proper for a member of a conference committee representing either body of Congress to discuss matters which are still in the hands of the conference committee for settlement. However, there has been so much persistent misrepresentation of the issues which are involved in the agricultural appropriation bill that in justice to myself, and also the Senate position, I feel I must make a brief statement to refute a consistently repeated falsehood that I have been

holding up action on the agricultural appropriation bill in order to pressure—that is the word that one radio commentator used; I think another one used the word "coerce"—to pressure or coerce the other body into accepting an item which was in the bill as it was presented to Congress by the Bureau of the Budget.

I refer to the item providing for a peanut marketing research laboratory to be located in my State. I do not disavow a consuming interest in that item. I was more interested in it than I was in any other item in the appropriation bill. I regretted very much to see it convicted and hanged on the floor of the House of Representatives on the basis of false testimony that was presented to that body concerning the nature of the proposed laboratory.

Eminent Members of the House held forth at length to the effect that it was a utilization research laboratory. If this had been true it would take work away from existing laboratories in Virginia, Louisiana, and other areas. As a result of that misrepresentation, the House, by a yea-and-nay vote, killed the item.

I wrote to the Secretary of Agriculture, asking him to write me a letter stating whether or not the statement that the project was to be a utilization laboratory was true. He replied, and I had that letter printed in the RECORD. In order to preserve the continuity of my statement, I ask unanimous consent that the correspondence again be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 20, 1962.

HON. ORVILLE FREEMAN,  
The Secretary of Agriculture,  
Department of Agriculture,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am writing to you in regard to the marketing research facility proposed in the budget estimates for 1963, to be located at Dawson, Ga.

In reviewing the Department's justification for this facility in the House hearings on page 1264, it briefly describes the purpose of research investigations to be conducted at this facility as dealing with the quality control requirements of peanuts in marketing and storage channels.

When this matter was under consideration in the House on September 18, the statement was made by Members opposed to the construction of the facility that it was being established as a utilization laboratory to develop uses of peanuts rather than for peanut quality research. Heretofore, it has been my understanding that research investigations for new uses on peanuts and peanut products are conducted at the Regional Utilization Laboratory at New Orleans, La.

I will appreciate it if you will clarify this entire matter, together with the extent of present utilization research and where it is done.

Sincerely,

RICHARD B. RUSSELL.

SEPTEMBER 24, 1962.

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR RUSSELL: Thank you for your letter of September 20, 1962, in which you refer to statements made in the House that the program proposed for the Dawson

Laboratory would be utilization research. The Department is pleased to state that you are correct in your understanding that the type of research to be done at the Dawson Laboratory is marketing research and not utilization research.

As you stated, the broad segments of the marketing research program contemplated for the laboratory, which was developed in consultation with a peanut industry working group and presented to your subcommittee by Mr. Pace, is described and justified by the Department in the House hearings on page 1264. Briefly, a major emphasis of the program would be the protection, maintenance, and improvement of quality in peanuts during marketing, including the development of improved and more objective methods for sampling and measuring quality and facilitating inspection and grading procedures. Included would be evaluations to determine the effect on market quality of various practices followed during production, harvesting, storage, handling, and conditioning operations. This would require the use of peanuts of known production, harvesting, and handling history which would be accomplished through cooperation with production research programs of the Department and the State agricultural experiment stations. It is also contemplated that standardized facilities and skilled personnel of the laboratory would be available to the industry and other research programs of the Department and the States in making quality evaluations on small samples of peanuts which represent new varieties or experimental conditions of production, harvesting, or handling.

Also, the program would be concerned with the development of effective methods for preventing, controlling, or eradicating insects in peanuts under various conditions of storage, handling, and treatment. Finally the program would seek to improve the efficiency of peanut marketing by developing improved equipment, work, and handling methods during the drying, shelling, and storage operation. The program would necessarily be concerned with quality evaluations and the effect on quality and end products of different practices being followed in the industry. But the laboratory would not be engaged in the development of new uses for peanuts or peanut products, which is the basic mission of utilization research.

Utilization research is conducted by the Southern Regional Utilization Research and Development Laboratory of ARS at New Orleans. About three-fourths of the resources of that Laboratory are allocated to research on new uses for cotton and cottonseed. The remaining one-fourth is concerned with rice, naval stores, sugar, and other crops, including peanuts. Of the total of approximately 225 professional man-years engaged in product and process development research in that Laboratory, 3 are assigned to peanuts which represent an annual expenditure of approximately \$69,000.

The Department appreciates the opportunity to help clarify some of the misconceptions which have arisen concerning the proposed laboratory.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, no one knows better than do the conferees on the part of the House, as well as my four colleagues who sat with me through long hours representing the Senate on the conference, that there is no truth whatever to the statement that the peanut laboratory is now the issue. The peanut laboratory relates to the marketing

service. It has nothing whatever to do with amendment No. 2, on which the Senate voted to insist by a vote of 77 to 0. One appears on page 3 under Agriculture Research and the other on page 15 under Agriculture Marketing Service. They are not even in the same item in the bill. I made it perfectly clear on occasion after occasion during the conference that, much as I regretted to see that budgeted item go down the drain, badly needed as it was to help the farmers of the whole peanut producing area, I would yield on it if the House would accept the one item in the bill, which dealt principally with research for utilization purposes and contained in amendment No. 2.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have said nothing about this subject, but to my own personal knowledge the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia has made the statement relative to the laboratory in his State on three different occasions, and on one occasion while we were meeting jointly with the leadership on the other side of the Capitol.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from making that statement.

In our efforts to bring this problem to an honorable conclusion, I discussed the issue which places the bill in jeopardy with the Democratic leadership on the other side of the Capitol. I discussed it with the leadership on both sides of the aisle in this Chamber.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I reiterate what the distinguished majority leader has said. I believe the distinguished Senator from Georgia made exactly that statement on at least two occasions. For the life of me, I cannot understand why people continue to talk just about peanuts.

Of course, I am not a member of the conference; but, as I understand, the Senator from Georgia is standing on a matter of principle from which he will not recede. As I recall, the Senate voted not to recede on the principle that the bill provide facilities for agricultural research. It may well be that within this category there may be some room for negotiation; but, in my judgment, the research items are among the most important in the entire bill.

As I understand the position of the Senator from Georgia, as it has been made perfectly clear to many of us, it is that, much as he regrets to do so—and I admire him for it—he is willing to yield on the so-called peanut laboratory if the principle is established that other research facilities shall be in the bill.

I commend the Senator. His principles and mine are not always in agreement; but I know that he is a man of principle and that when he takes a position, it is very difficult to budge him from it. In my judgment, his position in this instance is absolutely correct.

I have regretted the appearance in some quarters of notices to the effect that the Senator from Georgia is taking an obstructionist point of view. In my judgment, he is not taking such a position.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the issue is whether the Senate has a right to amend an appropriation bill in any and every respect. Year after year, the Senate has yielded to the fantasy that the Senate does not have the right to originate appropriation bills. We are in session today—in October—because we have accepted that fallacious construction of the Constitution, when in fact the Constitution does not contain one word which prohibits the Senate from initiating appropriation bills.

If the Senate had initiated four or five appropriation bills and had begun to hold hearings on them in January, Congress could have adjourned sine die by August 15. On the contrary, the Congress has remained in session until late in the fiscal year, waiting for the other body to send appropriation bills to us and give us a short time to consider them.

The agriculture appropriation bill, about which I am now speaking, reached the Senate on July 25, almost one month after the new fiscal year had begun. The independent offices appropriation bill reached the Senate on August 1. The military construction appropriation bill came to us on August 14. The public works appropriation bill for 1963 came to the Senate on August 16, almost 2 months after the beginning of the new fiscal year. This has been due to the fact that the Senate, in its tolerance and forbearance with the petulance of the other body has not challenged its right to initiate appropriation bills.

But in this case, Mr. President, when we reached the conference and came to these items on research, the House conferees said, "We will talk to you about the research items, but we will not discuss any item that has to do with the construction of a facility."

Mr. President, I told the conferees of the other body that I knew of no constitutional limitation on the Senate in that regard, and that I did not believe the Senate would accept one that was presented by five representatives of the other body in a conference. We were told that because the other body had not added any items for the construction of facilities, they struck out the peanut research item, although it was a budgeted item. I pointed out to them that that was not a correct statement, inasmuch as included in the House version of the bill, in this amendment No. 2, was an appropriation item by the other body for the construction of a poultry research facility at East Lansing, Mich.

So, Mr. President, the conference went on from there, with the House conferees even refusing to discuss any facility for research, because they said their committee had not included some items for research facilities that some Members of their body desired. That was a very



unusual position—to oppose our constitutional right to amend the bill to provide for necessary facilities because the House had failed to do so. Even if one accepts the fallacy that the Senate does not have a right to initiate an appropriation bill, certainly either body has a right to initiate any research facility construction item.

Mr. President, I have endeavored to deal with this situation with as much forbearance as I possibly could summon, and I am perfectly willing to continue to deal with it with forbearance; but I wish to state now that the Senate has receded so much on matters relating to appropriations that the other body has about concluded that it is the only body which has a right to deal in any way whatever with appropriations. If we surrender in this case, certainly we shall not only be surrendering this power under the Constitution, but we shall also be surrendering any contention that we are an equal and coordinate legislative body.

If the Senate has an ounce of self-respect, it will stay in session until Christmas if it takes this to establish our position as a coequal body in every respect.

#### FOREIGN AID AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1963— CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. HAYDEN to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 18, 20, 22, and 24.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record, at the conclusion of the adoption of the amendments of the conference report, a table showing the action taken on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.  
(See exhibit 1.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

#### UNNECESSARILY LARGE NUMBER OF TROOPS STATIONED IN MISSISSIPPI

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish to obtain the floor. However, if there is to be no further debate on the question of the motion of the Senator from Arizona, I am perfectly willing to have the vote on it taken.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I object; I wish to comment on this measure.  
Mr. STENNIS. Then, Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate only a few minutes—not for as long a time as I would otherwise do.

I wish to give a report, and then comment on it, about the number of troops remaining in and still assembled in or very near the State of Mississippi.

At 10 a.m. today, Washington time, there were 5,450 Regular U.S. Army troops in Oxford, Miss., or in the area of

Oxford, and 3,000 National Guard troops in regular service and on active duty.

In addition, at Columbus, Miss., some 150 miles to the east, there were 6,700 Regular U.S. Army troops. I understand that all of them are paratroopers, and that that group includes the four or five special "crack" units out of both the 82d Paratrooper Division and the 101st Paratrooper Division.

In addition, there were 4,500 National Guardsmen scattered all over the State, some as far as Biloxi and Gulfport, Miss., some 350 miles from Oxford—4,500 National Guardsmen, still under call, and ready to report to their respective armories. There was a relaxation insofar as some of the hardship cases were concerned as to the 4,500 guardsmen—to permit them to return home, and so forth, although they are required to remain very near the area, or at least subject to call. I know that one of these units includes a medium tank battalion of National Guardsmen, who are still on duty; and I know they are, because I called some of their commanding officers this morning—a medium tank battalion on duty more than 200 miles from Oxford, Miss.

Mr. President, the figures I have given total 19,600 men, as of 10 o'clock this morning. But, in addition, at Memphis, Tenn., just over the line from Mississippi, and about 70 miles from Oxford, there were an additional 6,170 troops—for a grand total of 25,770 military men on duty this morning, with the slight exceptions as to rigid duty which I stated as to some of the 4,500 National Guardsmen for whom there have been some relaxations.

At 10 o'clock this morning there were 6,700 paratroopers at Columbus. On the other hand, Mr. President, our country has only 6,000 troops in Berlin. I venture the estimate that in view of the availability of modern air transportation and all the other means available to them, 2,000 of these paratroopers could be at any point in Mississippi within almost a matter of minutes—either from Columbus or from anywhere else in the vicinity where they are located.

At the Columbia Airbase, one of our major SAC bases, the B-52's, and all the other equipment included in that program are on the alert. I understand that the alert has not been suspended, but there are 6,700 men on the runways or surrounding them.

This morning, at 10 o'clock, 2,700 men were moved out from the Memphis area and 2,700 men were moved out from the Columbus area. But even at this moment, after subtracting for those recent movements, we find that 20,370 men remain there, on duty.

Mr. President, if this is a military decision, how can the Appropriations Committee and the Armed Services Committee take seriously the representations of the military officers or the civilian officials as to what they need in order to do a certain job? How can we seriously appropriate funds based on estimates no sounder than this.

I do not believe this is a military estimate. I do not believe military men

would risk their professional reputation and standing by saying that under these conditions it is necessary to have 25,770 men on active duty there, as late as 10 o'clock this morning, Washington time. Instead, I believe it is a political decision.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Georgia, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Mississippi to state the population of Oxford, Miss.

Mr. STENNIS. It is about 7,000 or 8,000 people.

Mr. RUSSELL. Including both the whites and the blacks?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes, including all the civilians there. This is my estimate, and I am sure the population is not over 8,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. And that includes the women and the children also?

Mr. STENNIS. Oh, yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. How many students are there at the university?

Mr. STENNIS. In all, perhaps 4,500.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does that include the coeds?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes, several hundred coeds.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I was utterly dumfounded to hear about the extent of the concentration of armed forces in the Oxford area. Practically all of the combat-ready Regulars in this country were either there or all ready to go there. I have heard that 8 out of the 10 battle groups that constitute our 2 airborne divisions were sent to Mississippi. I was even more astonished to read where these troops were digging in and establishing foxholes and rifle pits. It seems that 25,000 troops in this small community would not have needed fortifications. I told the Secretary of Defense personally that I could see no necessity for such a vast concentration of armed forces. I venture to say that this is a greater number than General Grant had when he passed through Oxford after the capture of Vicksburg in 1863.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes; and I understand that Gen. George Washington never had that many troops under his command during the Revolutionary War.

Mr. RUSSELL. It would be interesting to know whether those who thought it necessary to deploy all of this military might in Oxford—and I believe I read the other day that the population of Oxford is about 6,800—

Mr. STENNIS. That is about right.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of which about 40 percent are colored. That number includes the lame, the halt, the blind, the babes in arms. If the same group of people are making our plans to deal with a new eventuality in Cuba, we have an easy answer as to why there has been such timidity and hesitation about imposing a quarantine on shipment of arms to Cuba. Those who concluded that it was necessary to deploy 25,000 of our firstline troops to Oxford, Miss., would

undoubtedly conclude that it would take 17 million Americans to defeat Cuba if this situation became necessary.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator for his timely remarks.

Mr. President, I raise the question, Is this a military decision? I do not believe it is. I do not believe the Chief of Staff would risk his reputation as a military man and certify here or anywhere else that he has any basis for the decision or that he believes the presence of these men is necessary.

Is it a logical decision? Of course it is not. It is an outrage. It is ridiculous on its face to be keeping these men there at such great cost. I will find out, in some way, how much the cost per day is. Of course, the Regular men have to be paid anyway, but I refer to the transportation costs and the cost of the additional men.

I repeat, Can we take seriously estimates that are put before us as to the military need with reference to any given situation?

I believe it is a political decision to keep these troops there, and I believe it is going to backfire. I believe there as an element which seeks to terrorize people, not only there, but elsewhere. It is un-American. It is undemocratic. It is contrary to the living spirit of the Constitution of the United States. I condemn it here on the floor of the Senate.

I stand for no violence. I stand for law and order. Most of the people in Mississippi stand for them.

#### NECESSITY OF OBEYING COURT DECISIONS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the people of the United States and the people of the whole globe are going through as difficult, as great, and as ugly a time as the world has ever seen. Like all my colleagues, I believe in law and order. I believe in peace with justice for the people of the United States and for the people of all the world.

The experiment in self-government in this country that has been in progress for the better part of two centuries is on trial. The unique and wonderful manner by which, in the 1700's, a group of colonial immigrants determined that self-government would be fashioned in America constitutes perhaps the most noble experiment in society's attempt to govern itself.

Part of the American system, with its theory of checks and balances, provides for an independent judicial branch. The basis upon which this theory of self-government must continue is on the basis of respect for law and order. When the Supreme Court, or the circuit court of appeals, or a Federal district court, or any State or local court makes a decision—object to it if you wish, Mr. President, but respect it. It is the law of the land, and it is so by virtue of the American Constitution. Respect the law of the land, Mr. President. That is the basis upon which people in this country are able to govern themselves.

I am not intimately acquainted with the manner by which the President of

the United States discharged his duty in the melancholy misfortune of the State which my friend represents in this Chamber. I respect the Senator from Mississippi as a friend and as a spokesman for his State. With the greatest of respect on my part, I say that, as I see it, the President of the United States had no choice, for if a person who wears temporarily the title of chief executive of a State or of a Commonwealth repudiates a decision of the circuit court, the seeds of destruction are planted in American society. And that must not, nor cannot be.

On that subject I rise to say that in my judgment, the President of the United States had no choice. Terrorism existed in Mississippi. I hope and pray that this ugly chapter in the history of America will prove to be the last, and that we may go forward, no matter what our religion or our racial background may be, and live together, and demonstrate to all the world that we are united in a desire to establish at home a society of peace and justice and equal treatment under law, and that we continue to accept the responsibility of leadership in the cause of peace and justice for all people.

#### FOREIGN AID AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1963—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. HAYDEN to concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 18, 20, 22, and 24.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish to speak for a moment on the conference report. Final action in connection with the conference report on mutual security is about to be taken, and the mutual security bill is nearing enactment. No great number of words will be uttered for the RECORD on this occasion, but I thought Senators might pardon me for speaking for a moment on mutual security. I have the honor to be a member of the Appropriations Committee.

I remember the leadership of Dwight Eisenhower, one of the greatest American military geniuses of all time, given to mutual security before he was President, while he was President, and after he ceased to be President.

I remember when General Lemnitzer, then Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, spoke before the Committee on Foreign Relations earlier this year. He referred to the Draper Committee report. Senators will remember the Draper Committee report. It was an excellent report by Americans dedicated to the security of this country.

General Lemnitzer quoted from the report:

The only alternative we can see to the interdependent allied free world, strengthened by our aid where needed, would be the Fortress America concept—taking our first stand in the last ditch.

We are all convinced that the mutual security program, both in its military and in its economic aspects, is a sound concept.

What is needed is the determination to continue it and the ability to administer it well.

Certainly I agree. There is waste in many offices of Government. There has been inexcusable waste in the mutual security program. War is waste at its unholy bloody utmost, Mr. President.

As I vote with the great majority of my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans together, in favor of a continuation of this program, I shall vote, in my judgment, for something which adds to the security of the American people.

Only a year ago I had the honor to be a Republican delegate in a bipartisan group led by the Vice President to visit, first, the new country of Senegal, to celebrate its independence; and thereafter to go to Geneva, where we were briefed by Ambassador Arthur Dean on the almost insurmountable problem—the thus far insurmountable problem—facing the free world, of trying honorably to negotiate a first-step dependable nuclear test ban agreement.

Then we went to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization headquarters. We saw there the proceedings incident to the 10th anniversary of the NATO shield. General Norstad was in command. We sat and watched soldiers representing every one of the 15 NATO countries, in their native military uniforms, come before us and run up their flags, standing together, demonstrating that in union there is indeed, strength, and that the people of the Atlantic Alliance stand together to deter potential Communist aggression.

I believe that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization needs to be strengthened by the governments of every NATO member including the Government of the United States, and I am trying, with my vote on this occasion, to strengthen NATO, because whatever amounts of money we may spend to make that an outstanding example of collective security, we shall thereby add to the security of our own people, of our own families, when we stand together with the nations of the free world.

The other day I read an article in the newspaper, written by the distinguished American columnist Joseph Alsop. He wrote about how critically important it is for American military personnel to help aid, guide, and educate those in southeast Asia to protect their freedom—and he spoke then of Vietnam—to be able to defend their own homes and their own communities, and what a tremendous value it is to the cause of man's freedom that the Government of the United States is making available some funds by the use of which the Vietnamese are able to learn how to use the weapons of defense and thus be able to extirpate from the native villages the Communist infiltrators who continue to come into their gallant country in order to try to take it over.

Also, because I think it is something that ought to be read by those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I ask unanimous consent that the table on the percentage of country contributions by NATO members to NATO be inserted in



the RECORD at this point. That is shown on page 425 of the hearings by the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Percentage of country contributions under international cost-sharing formulas, fiscal years 1962-64

Country	NATO infrastructure <sup>1</sup>	NATO military headquarter and military agencies	CEOA <sup>2</sup>	NMSSA <sup>3</sup>	SEATO <sup>4</sup>	Cento <sup>5</sup>
United States	30.85	24.20	39.00	25.70	25.00	20.00
United Kingdom	10.50	19.50	10.50	20.71	16.00	20.00
France	12.00	17.10	16.00	18.16	13.50	
Federal Republic of Germany	20.00	16.10	10.49	17.10		
Italy	5.97	5.96		6.33		
Canada	5.15	5.80	3.00			
Belgium	4.84	2.86	10.49	3.04		
Netherlands	3.83	2.85	10.49	3.03		
Denmark	2.87	1.65		1.75		
Turkey	1.10	1.65		1.75	20.00	
Norway	2.37	1.15		1.22		
Portugal	.28	.65		.69		
Greece	.67	.39		.42		
Luxembourg	.17	.09	.03	.10		
Iceland		.05				
Pakistan					8.00	20.00
Thailand					8.00	
Iran						20.00
Australia					13.50	
New Zealand					8.00	
Philippines					8.00	
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

<sup>1</sup> North Atlantic Treaty Organization, covers latest cost-sharing agreement for 1961-64 infrastructure programs.

<sup>2</sup> Central European (Pipeline) Operating Agency (NATO).

<sup>3</sup> NATO Maintenance Supply Services Agency.

<sup>4</sup> Southeast Asia Treaty Organization.

<sup>5</sup> Central Treaty Organization.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, before the Senate acts on the House amendments I invite attention to an article published in the New York Times this morning.

A large number of Senators including this Senator—representing a substantial minority, which may become a majority—voted for sharp cuts in the mutual security program. It has been our contention that there is unnecessary waste in foreign aid, and that it can be prevented if the program is operated more tightly.

In this connection, it is interesting to note that Chester Bowles, President Kennedy's special adviser on undeveloped areas, has proposed ending foreign aid to nations that "lack the competence, organization, and will" to use it effectively.

In connection with the same statement, Mr. Bowles said that the Agency for International Development is flooded with "a wide range of pressures from worried ambassadors, visiting foreign officials, and, at an increasing rate, from foreign lobbies."

This, Mr. Bowles said, should end. He said that the Agency should be "relieved from the responsibility" of mixing cold war considerations with economic needs when it must decide on a specific request.

The United States should not hesitate, he said "to publicize our differences with those governments which persistently stick to outmoded concepts designed to protect the status quo and which refuse to take the necessary steps to reform and strengthen their own economic and social systems."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**BOWLES PROPOSES FOREIGN AID LIMIT—URGES END OF HELP TO AREAS UNABLE TO USE IT PROPERLY—SETS PRIORITY OF NEED**

WASHINGTON, October 1.—Chester Bowles, President Kennedy's special adviser on undeveloped areas, has proposed ending foreign aid to nations that "lack the competence, organization and will" to use it effectively.

He has urged the administration to classify each nation that seeks assistance in one of four categories. He said those in the fourth should be "tactfully denied direct project assistance" but should not be ignored.

Mr. Bowles feels that by categorizing each nation and separating economic needs and cold war considerations, congressional and public uncertainty about the objectives of foreign aid will be eased.

**POLITICAL TIES BLAMED**

He made these suggestions in a memorandum circulated in the top echelon of the administration.

Mr. Bowles blamed what he called the "crazy quilt of political commitments which we inherited from the previous administration" for the lack of understanding about the foreign program.

Another problem, he continued, is that the Agency for International Development is flooded with "a wide range of pressures from worried ambassadors \* \* \* visiting foreign officials and, at an increasing rate, from foreign lobbies."

This should end, he asserted, and the Agency should be "relieved from the responsibility" of mixing cold war considerations with economic needs when it must decide on a specific request.

"The United States should not hesitate" his memorandum continued, "to publicize our differences with those governments which persistently stick to outmoded concepts designed to protect the status quo and which refuse to take the necessary steps to reform and strengthen their own economic and social systems."

Sources close to Mr. Bowles reported his ideas were received with great interest by most of those who had received the memorandum, including President Kennedy. They said Fowler Hamilton, head of the Agency for International Development, agreed with the memorandum in many respects.

The document also pleased such Democratic leaders in the Senate as MIKE MANSFIELD of Montana and HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, these sources said.

In the first category, Mr. Bowles would place nations with a per capita gross national product of more than \$350. Their current problems would be sufficiently acute to require aid, but their difficulties would result primarily from the "misuse and maldistribution" of their wealth.

Mr. Bowles lists in this category Greece, Venezuela, Lebanon, Cyprus, Singapore, Chile, Panama, Uruguay, Jamaica, Trinidad, and Argentina.

These nations, he feels, should be able "to put their financial houses in order." The United States, he says, should suggest corrective measures and advise them to introduce tax and land reforms and a more effective control of their foreign exchanges.

In the second category he would place nations with a gross national product of less than \$350, but which are "demonstrating outstanding competence and courage in mustering their own resources."

**INDIA IN SECOND GROUP**

He puts in this category Pakistan, India, Taiwan, El Salvador, Colombia, Nigeria, and Tunisia.

He proposes that in aiding these countries the United States should integrate its efforts with those of international lending agencies and other capital exporting countries, cut redtape, and assign the ablest people.

We should do this, he says, because "we are badly in need of some dramatic showcase examples of what outstanding performance by a recipient nation backed by generous U.S. assistance can accomplish."

In the third category he would place nations in an in-between category—countries with inadequate gross national products that are succeeding in some fields of self-help but failing in others.

In the fourth category he would assign hopeless nations that should be satisfied to get the services of the Peace Corps, the food-for-peace program and technical and advisory services of the United Nations.

Mr. Bowles declined to identify any nations he feels should be in the third and fourth categories.

The United States, he cautioned, should realize that more than half the nations receiving assistance have an authoritarian government of one kind or another. But a military regime can be acceptable, he said, if it is striving for reforms.

Mr. PROXMIRE. While I have supported mutual security in the past and expect to do so in the future, it has been my contention that the fight to reduce the cost of the program was a most constructive action on the part of some of us in the Senate who feel strongly that the only way to get more efficiency in this program is to vote to reduce the amounts of money, and to provide some discipline in the program, so that the waste will be a minimum.

The statement of Mr. Bowles indicates that the administration, too, recognizes that we have been wasting money in the foreign aid program and is resolved to do something positive and constructive about it.

Mr. President, as one who led the fight on the floor of the Senate to cut the ap-

proportions for foreign aid by \$785 million, I welcome and applaud this attitude of the administration that we can and should serve money in the foreign aid program.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly, so that the Senate may act on the pending question?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I should like to speak about 2 minutes in regard to the conference report.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Florida with the understanding that I shall not lose my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio yields to the Senator from Florida to speak on the conference report.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I support the conference report on the foreign aid bill. I am glad that the amount for foreign aid, properly speaking, has been reduced to a total of about \$3.9 billion. I am particularly glad that some of the additional items, which are by no means foreign aid, are approved under the conference report and were agreed upon by the conferees of both Houses.

One of those items about which I am most happy is the item for assistance to refugees in the United States, which means, of course, Cuban refugees. That problem centers largely in Miami, in the State which I represent in part. The

House conferees very graciously yielded on that particular item, and the bill from the conference restores the full amount of \$70,110,000, which, I wish to say for the Record, represents in part the payment of the costs of serving as the host area for that large number of refugees, now exceeding 100,000.

I am also happy about the inclusion of the item in the bill from the conference on the Philippine war damage claims in the total amount required to settle those claims; namely, in the amount of \$73 million, of which \$500,000 is to be allowed for salaries and expenses.

All Senators and other Americans will remember the difficult discussions and the troubles we had in the Far East, and particularly with the Filipinos, in connection with the early action in this session by the other body. I am glad that we have finally come to the stage not only of authorizing but also of appropriating for the settlement of the war claims of our allies, the Filipinos, in the great military effort made by them jointly with us.

I am happy also that the Peace Corps item is included in the bill, because I think that is proving to be a salutary effort in behalf of our own Nation and in behalf of the whole free world. That effort is in the field of peace, which is clearly real peace and not either in cold war or in hot war.

There are other items of that kind. I mention them merely because I think the bill is too often regarded solely be-

cause of its importance in the field of mutual assistance or foreign aid. Mentioning these three items in the Record will serve to bring out the fact that the bill will have important implications in other fields. I yield the floor.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I am happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I should like to ask the Senate conferees whether there is any intention in the bill to prohibit the use of refugee money in taking care of fugitives from Communist Yugoslavia?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The answer is categorically "No." In behalf and at the request of the chairman, I shall enlarge on that answer if the Senator from Ohio needs it. But the answer is categorically "No."

Mr. LAUSCHE. My examination of the language of the bill discloses no intention of prohibiting the use of refugee money in caring for fugitives out of Communist Yugoslavia.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator is 100 percent correct.

Mr. HAYDEN. There is no intention to discriminate against them.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona, which is to concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 18, 20, 22, and 24.

The motion was agreed to.

#### EXHIBIT 1

#### Comparative statement of appropriations for 1962, and estimates and amounts recommended in bill for 1963

##### TITLE I—FOREIGN AID (MUTUAL SECURITY)

Item	Appropriations, 1962	Budget estimates, 1963	Recommended in House bill for 1963	Amount recommended by Senate	Conference action
<b>FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT</b>					
<b>ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE</b>					
Development grants	\$296,500,000	335,000,000	\$225,000,000	\$275,000,000	\$225,000,000
Development grants, special authorization	100,000				
American hospitals abroad (special foreign currency program)		12,800,000	2,800,000	2,800,000	2,800,000
Investment guarantees		180,000,000	30,000,000	100,000,000	30,000,000
Surveys of investment opportunities	1,500,000	5,000,000		1,000,000	
International organizations and programs	153,500,000	148,900,000	148,900,000	148,900,000	148,900,000
Supporting assistance	425,000,000	481,500,000	350,000,000	400,000,000	395,000,000
Contingency fund	275,000,000	400,000,000	225,000,000	290,000,000	250,000,000
Alliance for Progress		600,000,000	525,000,000	575,000,000	525,000,000
Development loans	1,112,500,000	1,250,000,000	775,000,000	1,125,000,000	975,000,000
Administrative expenses (AID)	47,800,000	55,000,000	46,000,000	52,000,000	49,500,000
Administrative expenses (State)	3,000,000	3,100,000	2,700,000	3,100,000	2,700,000
Subtotal, economic assistance	2,314,600,000	3,461,300,000	2,330,400,000	2,972,800,000	2,603,900,000
<b>MILITARY ASSISTANCE</b>					
Military assistance	1,600,000,000	1,500,000,000	1,300,000,000	1,450,000,000	1,325,000,000
Total, Title I—Foreign Aid (Mutual Security)	3,914,600,000	4,961,300,000	3,630,400,000	4,422,800,000	3,928,900,000

##### TITLE II—FOREIGN AID (OTHER)

<b>FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT</b>					
Peace Corps	\$30,000,000	\$63,750,000	\$52,000,000	\$63,750,000	\$59,000,000
<b>DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY</b>					
Ryukyu Islands	7,080,000	14,282,000	7,900,000	12,000,000	8,900,000
<b>DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE</b>					
Assistance to refugees in the United States (Cuban refugees)		70,110,000	55,000,000	70,110,000	70,110,000
<b>DEPARTMENT OF STATE</b>					
Migration and refugee assistance		21,977,000	14,447,000	16,677,000	14,947,000
Investment in the Inter-American Development Bank	110,000,000	60,000,000	60,000,000	60,000,000	60,000,000
Subscription to the International Development Association	61,656,000	61,656,000	61,656,000	61,656,000	61,656,000
Total, Title II—Mutual Security (Other)	208,745,000	201,775,000	251,003,000	284,193,000	274,613,000

See footnotes at end of table.



## Comparative statement of appropriations for 1962, and estimates and amounts recommended in bill for 1963—Continued

## TITLE III—INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

Item	Appropriations, 1962	Budget estimates, 1963	Recommended in House bill for 1963	Amount recom- mended by Senate	Conference action
<b>FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT</b>					
Loans to the International Monetary Fund.....		\$ 2,000,000,000	\$2,000,000,000	\$2,000,000,000	\$2,000,000,000

## TITLE IV—EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

Limitation on operating expenses.....	(\$1,900,000,000)	(\$1,295,000,000)	(\$1,295,000,000)	(\$1,295,000,000)	(\$1,295,000,000)
Limitation on administrative expenses.....	(3,010,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)

## TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS AGENCIES

<b>FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION</b>					
Payment of Philippine war damage claims.....		\$ 73,000,000	\$73,000,000	\$73,000,000	\$73,000,000
Salaries and expenses.....		560,000	(10)	450,000	
<b>U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY</b>					
Acquisition and construction of radio facilities.....		11 7,375,000	1,600,000		1,600,000
<b>DEPARTMENT OF STATE</b>					
<b>INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES</b>					
International conferences and contingencies.....		11 1,019,000	849,000	849,000	849,000
Total, Title V—Miscellaneous Agencies.....		81,954,000	75,449,000	74,409,000	75,449,000
Grand total, all titles of the bill.....	\$4,123,345,000	7,335,029,000	5,956,852,000	6,781,402,000	6,278,962,000

<sup>1</sup> Contained in H. Doc. 430.<sup>2</sup> Contained in H. Docs. 430 and 503. H. Doc. 430 substituted a request for an appropriation of \$100,000,000 in lieu of the request for an authorization to expend from debt receipts in the same amount, as proposed in the January budget.<sup>3</sup> Reflects decrease of \$18,500,000 in H. Doc. 430.<sup>4</sup> Includes \$425,000,000 for loans and \$100,000,000 for grants.<sup>5</sup> Includes \$6,000,000 contained in H. Doc. 378 and \$382,000 contained in H. Doc. 463.<sup>6</sup> Contained in H. Doc. 514.<sup>7</sup> Contained in H. Doc. 524.<sup>8</sup> Contained in H. Doc. 446.<sup>9</sup> Contained in H. Doc. 535.<sup>10</sup> \$500,000 made available in item, Payment of "Philippine war damage claims."<sup>11</sup> Contained in H. Doc. 537.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I yield, provided I do not lose my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized.

## TROOPS IN MISSISSIPPI

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I presume many Senators were as shocked as I was today upon hearing the report of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi that as of this morning 25,000 troops are in Mississippi. It is true that the operation is expensive. But to me there is something more significant than that. What disturbs me is that if the President is required to send 25,000 troops to Mississippi to get a Governor of his own party to cooperate with his own President, it represents something pretty serious and a breakdown in the kind of relationships which should exist.

This is not a discussion between two political parties or two partisans. The people of Mississippi voted for the President who sent those 25,000 troops down to camp on the campus of the University of Mississippi. I am disturbed about relationships of that kind because unless we can develop more harmonious formulas for enforcing the laws of the United States, unless we can develop some better form of persuasiveness whereby the President can exercise the high prestige and power of his office to bring about the enforcement of law, one must become pessimistic about the prospects of that President conferring with Khrushchev

of Moscow, who did not vote for it, who does not belong to his own party, and whose people did not support him in a great election.

How will the President of the United States persuade Khrushchev to conform with international law if he cannot compel members of his own party to cooperate in a State which has supported him faithfully and supported every President who appointed the Justices of the Supreme Court who made the initial decision to which the Mississippians object?

How is that type of relationship to be made to function? We agree, I believe, that 25,000 troops sounds like a great many. I do not know how many were required. But I wish the President and the Attorney General would devote as much time, talent, energy, and thought to developing a positive program toward Cuba as they have devoted toward developing a positive program for Mississippi. At least they got the job done in Mississippi. Everyone knows what American policy is vis-a-vis Mississippi. But I daresay that no one in America can tell what our policy is vis-a-vis Cuba, because we do not have it in hand. We do know that the Russian military buildup in Cuba is expanding. We do not know what the answer is. We would like to have guidelines. Congress has enacted legislation under which the President has been mandated to take some positive action. We have told him that we would support him. But the 25,000 troops are not being encamped, trained, and directed in connection with the Cuban problem. They are directed toward the Missis-

sippi problem, which I join the rest of the Senate in hoping will speedily be solved.

## FARM PROGRAM

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I take the Senate floor at this time primarily to point out that it is never pleasant for a prophet of bad news to have his prophecy vindicated. Along with other Senators, I said on the Senate floor at the time we passed the 1962 farm bill and adopted the conference report that it was a sorry day for American agriculture. I said it was bad news for the family farmer of America.

On the basis of the evidence which is now before us and which has since been publicized, I must say that this is a very bad piece of news for American agriculture in view of the generally recognized knowledge now as to the portent and content of the farm bill. I invite the attention of Senators to an Associated Press story which appeared on page 32 of the Sunday, October 7, issue of the New York Times.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator knows that the Senate is still in the morning hour. Will the Senator permit the Chair to ask whether there is further morning business?

Mr. MUNDT. Certainly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If there is no further morning business, morning business is closed.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 2 or 3 additional minutes?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I wish to read the article into the RECORD because I think the Senate and the country are entitled to know how the farm bill has been objectively analyzed and objectively interpreted. People might look with a jaundiced eye, I suppose, at what the Senator from South Dakota, who happens to be a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and who is a Republican, and opposes the bill, may say. We may be told, "That is a partisan statement on the Senator's part because the bill is a Democratic bill."

I suppose the same people, or others like them, would look with a jaundiced eye when Secretary of Agriculture Freeman states that it is a wonderful piece of legislation and a great breakthrough for the farmer, or when any Democratic spokesman tries to support it because it is a Democratic bill.

So let us forget what the Democratic spokesmen say in praise of the bill and what the Republicans say in criticism. Let us rely, if we may, on an objective analysis by the talented farm experts and reporters of the Associated Press who have analyzed the bill and who, in yesterday's issue of the New York Times, told us exactly what will happen.

The headline states: "Kennedy Gambles on Farm Program."

The difficulty is that the President does not gamble his own money. He is not in the farming business. He is not gambling his own cattle, his own hogs, or his own cornfields. He is gambling with the farmer's future and with the farmer's products.

The subhead of the article reads: "Makes Plan Less Palatable To Gain New Controls."

Those words could be found in the speeches of the Senators who opposed the bill at the time we passed it.

I read the article:

WASHINGTON, October 6.—The Kennedy administration has taken a calculated risk in the new farm act that may or may not pay off next year.

The gamble is on the livestock feed grain program, starting in 1964, which the administration succeeded in obtaining despite the reluctance of Congress.

From the standpoint of most growers this program is so much worse than the one it will replace that the administration believes the next Congress will pass a new one more to its liking.

I wish to reread that paragraph in the hope that every American farmer will find it in the RECORD, in his newspaper, hear it on the radio, or see it on the television.

The farmers should know that in 1964 they face catastrophic consequences as a result of the 1962 Farm Act with its program of flexible, falling farm supports which far out-Benson Ezra Benson.

The Associated Press analysts say:

From the standpoint of most growers this program is so much worse than the one it will replace that the administration believes the next Congress will pass a new one more to its liking.

I continue to read from the Associated Press article:

The administration wants authority to invoke, with the farmers' approval, controls

on production of feed grains as well as of other farm products affected from time to time by surpluses.

These controls, which the administration refers to as supply management, would be intended to stabilize production at levels necessary to meet all demands and maintain a safe reserve.

#### REJECTED BY CONGRESS

Congress refused to approve such controls for the feed grains this year. Many Senators and Representatives contended that the legislation enacted in 1958 under the Eisenhower administration would operate satisfactorily to stabilize feed grains if it were allowed to function.

This law removed acreage allotments from corn, the major feed grain. It also set price supports at 90 percent of the average market price during the previous 3 years. This allowed a lower support rate than had prevailed under previous legislation. Advocates said it would tend to discourage overproduction and bring about a balance between supplies and requirements.

But the Kennedy administration refused to go along with this program. It set up in 1961, continued this year and got Congress to extend through next year, a program that offers grain producers payments for leaving a part of their feed grain land idle and price supports on their production.

That bill was unanimously approved by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry a year ago. I was among those who supported it. It increased farm income to some extent; very little and inadequately, but it pointed it up a little, and it reduced surpluses, which are now being stored at such great expense to the American taxpayers.

I continue to quote:

Failing to get the House to approve a control program, administration leaders set to work to make the old program less acceptable in the hope that next year's Congress would approve permanent controls, beginning in 1964.

Since some of the farm magazines, some of the writers on agricultural problems, and some of those who send out agricultural newsletters have failed to detect what is clearly written in the bill, let me refer to what these analysts for the Associated Press, who are free of bias and partisanship and political motivations, point out so clearly; namely, that the hope is "that next year's Congress would approve permanent controls beginning in 1964."

That means permanent controls over the American farmer starting in 1964.

I read further:

#### SUPPORTS LESS PALATABLE

The act of 1958 was amended to make its price supports less palatable. The amendment requires the Secretary of Agriculture to set feed grain supports at between 50 and 90 percent of parity, a formula devised to give farmers a fair market price in comparison with their costs of production. But the price level must be set so that it will not result in adding more feed grain stocks to the surplus.

In other words, the minimum support under the administration's new law is 80 cents a bushel for corn.

In other words, the minimum support under the administration's new law is 80 cents a bushel for corn.

This should be of interest to the people of Wisconsin, Ohio, Indiana, Iowa, Ne-

braska, South Dakota, and North Dakota. Here we have it factually stated, from an objective source, that the administration has devised a program, starting in 1964, setting the price of corn at 80 cents a bushel.

That is precisely what was predicted on the floor of the Senate at the time we made the valiant but losing fight to defeat the monstrosity in the form of a farm bill.

I read further:

This compares with a minimum of \$1.05 that would have prevailed if the act of 1958 had been left unchanged.

In other words, Mr. President, the farmers of America, starting in 1964, will lose a cool 25 cents a bushel in the price supports paid for corn.

I read on:

As a consequence, when Congress takes up farm legislation next year, the administration will be in a position to say that if permanent controls are not authorized, the corn supports would have to be cut back to 80 cents.

The administration is confident that Congress, faced with this choice, will finally agree, however reluctantly, to approve the administration's program of controls.

That is the end of the Associated Press article. This is almost the end of the speech by the Senator from South Dakota, except to say that this was in the debate record before the Members of the Senate or the Members of the House voted to approve the bill. It was obscure, it was in fine print, it was phased out, it was difficult to find in the long, winding sentences, but there it was, precisely as predicted and precisely as now reported by the Associated Press.

So Congress will come back next January, and the pistol will be held at the head of the farmer and he will be told, "We have you in a box. Vote for permanent controls. Vote for price supports on livestock. Vote for marketing quotas. Vote for production controls on livestock. Do all that or else you will get 80 cents for corn and 92 cents for wheat, and feed grains will be marked down in price supports because the law holds that they have to be related to the falling price supports for corn."

I predict that after the voters of America in the Farm Belt understand the bill, and after the election is held and the votes are counted, we will have a Congress, both in the House and in the Senate, which will not yield to this kind of pistol-at-the-head legislation, but which will insist on some sound economic principles being written into the law, increasing farm income, instead of decreasing it by legislative mandate, as was done in the Farm Act of 1962; and that we will write legislation which in the final analysis will free farmers to produce more at a fair price, instead of trying to starve them into submission and to create for them a survival type of economy carrying them back to the status of the peasants of Asia and Africa and Europe.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the New York Times press story be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.



There being no objection, the story was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**KENNEDY GAMBLE ON FARM PROGRAM—MAKES PLAN LESS PALATABLE TO GAIN NEW CONTROLS**

WASHINGTON, October 6.—The Kennedy administration has taken a calculated risk in the new farm act that may or may not pay off next year.

The gamble is on the livestock feed grain program, starting in 1964, which the administration succeeded in obtaining despite the reluctance of Congress.

From the standpoint of most growers this program is so much worse than the one it will replace that the administration believes the next Congress will pass a new one more to its liking.

The administration wants authority to invoke, with the farmers' approval, controls on production of feed grains as well as of other farm products affected from time to time by surpluses.

These controls, which the administration refers to as supply management, would be intended to stabilize production at levels necessary to meet all demands and maintain a safe reserve.

**REJECTED BY CONGRESS**

Congress refused to approve such controls for the feed grains this year. Many Senators and Representatives contended that the legislation enacted in 1958 under the Eisenhower administration would operate satisfactorily to stabilize feed grains if it were allowed to function.

This law removed acreage allotments from corn, the major feed grain. It also set price supports at 90 percent of the average market price during the previous 3 years. This allowed a lower support rate than had prevailed under previous legislation. Advocates said it would tend to discourage overproduction and bring about a balance between supplies and requirements.

But the Kennedy administration refused to go along with this program. It set up in 1961, continued this year, and got Congress to extend through next year a program that offers grain producers payments for leaving a part of their feed grain land idle and price supports on their production.

Failing to get the House to approve a control program, administration leaders set to work to make the old program less acceptable in the hope that next year's Congress would approve permanent controls, beginning in 1964.

**SUPPORTS LESS PALATABLE**

The act of 1958 was amended to make its price supports less palatable. The amendment requires the Secretary of Agriculture to set feed grain supports at between 50 and 90 percent of parity, a formula devised to give farmers a fair market price in comparison with their costs of production. But the price level must be set so that it will not result in adding more feed grain stocks to the surplus.

In other words, the minimum support under the administration's new law is 80 cents a bushel for corn. This compares with a minimum of \$1.05 that would have prevailed if the act of 1958 had been left unchanged.

As a consequence, when Congress takes up farm legislation next year, the administration will be in a position to say that if permanent controls are not authorized, the corn supports would have to be cut back to 80 cents.

The administration is confident that Congress, faced with this choice, will finally agree, however reluctantly, to approve the administration's program of controls.

**AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954—MEDICAL AND OTHER BENEFITS FOR RETIRED EMPLOYEES**

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIRE in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 10117) to amend section 401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to provide that plans which provide certain medical and other benefits for retired employees and their families may be qualified pension plans.

**CASTRO**

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, on the "Meet the Press" television program Sunday evening, Richard Nixon was critical of the Kennedy administration regarding Cuba, saying the Nation was "wanting more action than President Kennedy has been giving."

Is he an advocate of preemptive war? Is he urging that this Nation send our airpower and our Marines into Cuba or is he urging a naval blockade?

It is easy for irresponsible and thoughtless people to charge that it is high time the Kennedy administration is doing something about Cuba. When Richard Nixon makes a statement such as he did Sunday that he wants more actions toward Cuba, he can only mean one thing—some sort of military or naval action.

This candidate for Governor of a State could only mean by "action" the actual invasion of Cuba by our Armed Forces, possibly with some Cuban refugees armed and trained by us placed in the forefront of the landing force under the protection of our bomber and fighter planes and with our naval vessels cruising just offshore from this little island.

If former Vice President Nixon in advocating more action does not mean military or naval action, then the least he means is a tight naval blockade.

Let us assume the United States declares a naval blockade of Cuba. Such blockade would either bar all shipping to Cuba or would exempt only food and medicines.

An American warship hails a Russian ship carrying supplies to Cuba. The captain of this vessel refuses to halt. Then we fire a shot across its bow. The captain still refuses to halt. Do we sink the unarmed Russian ship headed for Cuba? Or if a vessel carrying the flag of some other nation follows the same course and its captain fails to halt when the shot goes across its bow, do we then sink that ship? If so, that is an act of war on our part. Following that time were we to take such aggressive action the Soviet Union would doubtless take one of two courses. The extreme course it would take would be to fire intercontinental ballistic missiles with atomic warheads at targets in this country from missile bases in Siberia and elsewhere within the Soviet Union. Instead of

adopting such a course, another policy might appear opened to the Russians. The submarines and naval vessels of the Soviet Union could retaliate by firing on or sinking American ships carrying supplies to our airbases or ground forces in Iran, Turkey, and other lands allied to us that are close to the Soviet Union, as Cuba is to us.

If we take more action, as this California officeseeker, who was formerly Vice President and an advocate of watchfulness and patience regarding Cuba back in 1960, when he was defending the Eisenhower policies, suggests, and adopt the precedent of firing on Russian ships headed for Cuba, or perhaps sink one, what then would we do if and when the Soviet Union in retaliation sinks one of our unarmed supply ships or fires on one carrying merchandise toward a harbor of a country neighboring the Soviet Union allied and friendly to us and definitely not within the Soviet orbit?

Instead of listening to or heeding warmongers—even should former high-ranking public officials, even an ex-Vice President, give them aid and comfort—let us think this through. Now is the time for deliberation, calculation, and clear thinking. This Nation has an impregnable naval base within Cuba. Not only do we have the Guantanamo Naval and Air Base there, but we have naval and airbases in the nearby Canal Zone and neighboring Puerto Rico. This Nation has the capability of destroying all airbases and whatever missile bases there are in Cuba and all artillery emplacements there within hours. Were we to take such action, as some foolish people suggest we do at this time, we would risk losing the friendship of officials and peoples of Mexico and many of the people and officials of most, if not all, of the Republics of Central and South America. Such action would be regarded as some confirmation of Khrushchev's claims that we are Yankee imperialists and aggressors.

In Cincinnati last Friday evening, President Kennedy, as leader of the Democratic Party, addressed a huge rally in beautiful Fountain Square, in the heart of that city, and within a hundred yards or so of the Republican Headquarters of Hamilton County. On display in the headquarters and being carried outside and in the crowd were many placards waved in the crowd, presumably by members of that Grand Old Party of which I am not a member. They were printed signs of this sort:

Shame, Kennedy; 100,000 GI's Fight Ole Miss. No GI's Fight Castro.

Jack Kennedy, Conqueror of Ole Miss.

Shame, Kennedy; Mississippi Yes, Cuba No.

Kennedy Brutality in Mississippi—Nothing Cuba.

Malcolm S. Forbes, editor and publisher of Forbes magazine, one of the most authoritative financial magazines published in our country, wrote a fine lead editorial in the latest issue of his magazine. The editorial is entitled: "Cuba: Cold Logic, Not Hot Anger."

Incidentally, Malcolm S. Forbes a few years ago was the Republican candidate

for Governor of New Jersey. He is a loyal, resolute, farsighted American patriot, and his statements certainly merit respect and consideration. He wrote:

We set the precedent by sinking Russian ships bound for Cuba. How do we react when she sinks ours supplying her unfriendly neighbors? It doesn't take much imagination to foresee that overnight we would be at the brink—or over it—of global atomic annihilation.

If one pauses to think, it becomes clear that Cuba, no matter how well supplied militarily, represents no real military threat to the United States. A very small number of short-range missiles would eliminate any menace in moments. Russian missiles can land anywhere in the United States from their own bases in their own land. They don't need Cuba as a launching spot.

The depth of American emotions about Russian aid to Red Cuba is very real and understandable. But emotions are a poor guide in a case like this.

Aside from a blockade, it is plain today that no small-scale invasion using conventional weapons would be successful. We would need a major effort by the Armed Forces, and it would come at a time when, after November 6, election day, the Berlin crisis will be unquestionably at a dangerous peak. When Khrushchev signs a "peace" treaty with East Germany as he plans to do, we cannot and will not allow East Germany to interfere or in any way control our access to West Berlin. The possibilities of a shooting war are going to be closer than ever in a few weeks over Berlin. In this situation, NATO and our allies are solidly agreed that there can be no retreat.

Such is simply not the case in connection with Cuba.

The dangers in Cuba come not because it is any military threat to this country, but because it forms a closer base for Red penetration in South America. We certainly can be effective in preventing the export of arms and subversives from Cuba to South American shores.

Measures are being considered to isolate the Cuban virus; but those so earnestly and loudly advocating military action should realize that they are being emotional at a time when cold logic is called for.

All this was written before Mr. Nixon responded to a question on the television program, Meet the Press, on Sunday. But what Mr. Malcolm Forbes wrote in his editorial strikes the former Vice President directly in the forehead. Mr. Forbes said, and I repeat:

Those so earnestly and loudly advocating military "action" should realize that they are being emotional at a time when cold logic is called for.

It seems the vogue for people to say we are doing nothing about Castro. The truth is this Nation is doing everything against him that can be done short of waging a shooting war. We have adopted an embargo. We are keeping Cuba under constant surveillance. No freighter from the Soviet Union or any other nation carrying and unloading armaments and men to Castro's Cuba has escaped our watchfulness.

Mr. President, whatever we do in military, naval, and air action against Castro and his forces should be done in cooperation with the Organization of American States.

Americans would do well to remember our President's statement at his recent press conference:

If at any time the Communist buildup in Cuba were to endanger or interfere with our security in any way, including our base at Guantanamo, our passage to the Panama Canal, our missile and space activities at Cape Canaveral, or the lives of American citizens in this country, or if Cuba should ever attempt to export its aggressive purposes by force, or the threat of force, against any nation in this hemisphere, or become an offensive military base of significant capacity for the Soviet Union, then this country will do whatever must be done to protect its own security and that of its allies.

Surely, Mr. President, the statement by President Kennedy which I have just quoted should satisfy anyone, other than a demagog or an officeseeker who is altogether disregarding the facts, and is appealing to the passions of people.

Our President, throughout his administration, from the inaugural and continuing through his forceful conference with Khrushchev at Vienna, to this good hour, has been firm, determined, and implacable in dealing with Communist aggression in Berlin and with Castroism, its manifestation in Cuba.

Mr. President, it has been my privilege to speak personally with our new Ambassador to the Soviet Union and with another gentleman, both of whom were present with President Kennedy in Vienna, when he confronted Khrushchev, shortly after Mr. Kennedy's inauguration as President. I was proud to hear them narrate the firmness and the determination with which President Kennedy at that time stood up to Khrushchev. It was noted at that time that President Kennedy came away from the conference with a somber attitude. But certainly we can be proud of the attitude he maintained at the conference. That was not similar to the situation in 1960, following the U-2 mischance, when, unfortunately, as we read in the newspapers, Khrushchev indulged in bombast, blustering, and epithets, when face to face with the then President of the United States; and at that time the newspapers reported that President Eisenhower listened in dignified silence. But that did not happen at Vienna. I know it did not, because our new Ambassador to the Soviet Union, an Ohioan, and a career diplomat for many, many years, with a perfect command of the Russian language, was present at the conference in Vienna, along with the other gentleman, an interpreter.

Mr. President, the continuing Berlin crisis is fraught with greater danger to the peace of the world than is the Soviet buildup in Cuba. The latter may be attributed in large part to the fact that Castro is in deep trouble with his own people. Congress, in the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 230, demonstrates that the American people are solidly behind the determined no-appeasement policies of President Kennedy. He is the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces and he has the entire support—as he should—of the American people—despite the placard carrying of

some dimwits who are seeking a slogan, as they file out of some political headquarters.

In the other body, some outstanding Members spoke out in a sane, calm manner amid this mob clamor. I refer to the statement by Representative CELLER, Democrat, of New York, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, who stated:

The situation in Cuba has certainly affected emotionally a number of elected officials and editors, and has clouded their judgment. Without enlarging upon the proposals they have put forward and examining all possible consequences, they have demanded a naval blockade of Cuba, or outright invasion of Cuba. A naval blockade is, of course, an act of war. A direct invasion at the present time could be easily interpreted as first, an act of aggression which would give the Soviet Union an unprecedented propaganda issue; second, a U.S. acceptance of the principle of preventive war; third, an invitation to the Soviet Union to bomb with rockets our bases on the periphery of Russia and her satellites. I believe most firmly that such loose talk must cease \* \* \*.

Representative BOLAND, Democrat, of Massachusetts, said:

This is no time to listen to political sorcerers, hucksters and adventurers \* \* \* only the foolhardy and unthinking would plunge this Nation into an unneeded and unwanted war \* \* \*.

Representative COHELAN, Democrat, of California, said:

A great nation must have a sense of historical perspective. An invasion of Cuba at this time would utterly destroy the moral influence and authority—and much of the actual power—we now enjoy in the councils of nations. We would be relegated \* \* \* to the footsteps left by the Soviets in smashing into Hungary.

Earl T. Smith, U.S. Ambassador to Cuba in 1959, is said to be authority for the statement that the Eisenhower administration shipped military equipment to Fidel Castro, and then helped him consolidate his control over Cuba.

Americans will remember that General Eisenhower was President when Batista fled from Cuba.

That was December 31, 1958. The facts are that the Eisenhower administration applied an arms embargo against Batista—this despite the fact that Ernesto Guevara, a top commander under Castro, had fought for the Communists in Guatemala, and our intelligence services knew that Guevara was a Communist. It is said that he was the mastermind behind Castro. This should have been known by our CIA officials at the time, and probably was known to them.

About 8 months before the time when Batista left Cuba and Castro marched into Havana, Drew Pearson in his column stated, "The Caribbean Legion—30 Percent Communist—has been fighting for Castro." Also, this nationally famed columnist reported that Castro had participated in Communist-inspired riots in Bogotá, Colombia, back in 1948. That was known, or should have been known, not only by President Eisenhower, but also by our then Vice President, who



now is merely an officeseeker in California, and is snatching at this in an effort to reverse the polls, which seem to be going against him.

During the Eisenhower administration, some Cuban air force officers, now flying Soviet-made planes for Castro, were accepted for training in the United States by officials of the Eisenhower administration, and were trained in this country, at the expense of the U.S. taxpayers. However, that fact was not referred to by Mr. Nixon last Sunday.

Our people should be reminded that during the last year of the Eisenhower administration in 1960, the Soviet Union exported to Cuba 51-ton tanks. Those who served in the Armed Forces overseas know that 51-ton tanks are huge, powerful tanks. There were also received in Cuba from the Soviet Union during the year 1960 many tons of other military equipment, including heavy field artillery guns, and, in addition, Soviet military observers and advisers were landing in Cuba throughout 1960, and some of them landed there in 1959.

I yield the floor.

#### EXTENSION OF CONTRACT MAIL ROUTES UP TO 100 MILES DURING CONTRACT TERM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2242, House bill 10936.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 10936) to permit the Postmaster General to extend contract mail routes up to 100 miles during the contract term.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with amendments on page 1, after line 6, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. (a) Section 4369 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows: "§ 4369. Filing of information relating to publications of the second class

"(a) Each owner of a publication having second-class mail privileges under section 4354 of this title shall furnish to the Postmaster General at least once a year, and shall publish in such publication once a year, information in such form and detail and at such time as he may require respecting—

"(1) the identity of the editor, managing editor, publishers, and owners;

"(2) the identity of the corporation and stockholders thereof, if the publication is owned by a corporation;

"(3) the identity of known bondholders, mortgages, and other security holders;

"(4) the extent and nature of the circulation of the publication, including, but not limited to, the number of copies distributed, the methods of distribution, and the extent to which such circulation is paid in whole or in part: *Provided, however,* That trade publications serving the arts or cultural interests need only to furnish such information to the Postmaster General; and

"(5) such other information as he may deem necessary to determine whether the publication meets the standards for second-class mail privileges.

The Postmaster General shall not require the names of persons owning less than 1 per centum of the total amount of stocks, bonds, mortgages, or other securities.

"(b) Each publication having second-class mail privileges under section 4355(b) of this title shall furnish to the Postmaster General information in such form and detail, and at such times, as he requires to determine whether the publication continues to qualify thereunder. In addition, the Postmaster General may require each publication which has second-class mail privileges under section 4355(a) or 4356 of this title to furnish information, in such form and detail and at such times as he may require, to determine whether the publication continues to qualify thereunder.

"(c) The Postmaster General shall make appropriate rules and regulations to carry out the purposes of this section, including provision for suspension or revocation of second-class mail privileges for failure to furnish the required information."

(b) The table of contents of chapter 63 of such title is amended by striking out "4369. Affidavits relating to publications of the second class."

and inserting in lieu thereof "4369. Filing of information relating to publications of the second class."

And, on page 3, after line 18, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 3. The second paragraph of section 2 of the Act of August 24, 1912, as amended by the Act of June 11, 1960 (74 Stat. 208; Public Law 86-513), and by paragraph 34 of the first section of the Act of June 11, 1960 (74 Stat. 202; Public Law 86-507), is hereby repealed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service I send to the desk an amendment to a committee amendment, of a corrective nature, and move its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Montana to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 2, line 16, in the committee amendment, to strike out "arts or cultural interests" and insert in lieu thereof "performing arts".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Montana to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that the remaining committee amendments be agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An Act to permit the Postmaster General to extend contract mail routes up to 100 miles during the contract term, and for other purposes."

#### VALIDATION OF COVERAGE FOR CERTAIN STATE AND LOCAL EMPLOYEES IN ARKANSAS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2014, House bill 12820.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 12820) to validate the coverage of certain State and local employees in the State of Arkansas under the agreement entered into by such State pursuant to section 218 of the Social Security Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Maine will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 2, line 8, to insert the following:

SEC. 2. Section 218(p) of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting "Maine" after "Kansas".

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the amendment contains the substance of legislation which was approved by the House last week in H.R. 8853.

I ask unanimous consent that appropriate portions of the House report on that bill be printed in the RECORD as an explanation of the bill.

There being no objection, the extract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 8853 is to amend title II of the Social Security Act to include Maine among the States which may obtain social security coverage, under State agreement, for State and local policemen and firemen.

#### GENERAL STATEMENT

Your committee's bill would make applicable to the State of Maine the provision in present law which permits 17 specified States and all interstate instrumentalities to extend coverage (under their agreements with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare) to services performed by employees of any such State (or of any political subdivision thereof) in any policeman's or fireman's position covered by a retirement system of a State or local government, provided the members of the system vote in favor of coverage. The 17 States in which policemen and firemen covered by a State or local retirement system are now permitted to come under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program are: Alabama, California, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Kansas, Maryland, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Vermont, Virginia, and Washington.

Existing law provides adequate assurance that old-age, survivors and disability insurance coverage will be extended only to groups of policemen or firemen who want such coverage. Under the present referendum provisions of the Social Security Act, members of a State or local government retirement system group have a voice in any decision to cover them under old-age, survivors and disability insurance. In addition

existing law contains a declaration that it is the policy of the Congress that the protection afforded members of a State or local government retirement system not be impaired as a result of the extension of old-age and survivors insurance coverage to members of the system.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Maine.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is not desired to go to a third reading of the bill yet.

#### REGULATION OF DISTRIBUTION OF HABIT-FORMING BARBITURATE AND AMPHETAMINE DRUGS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on May 23, 1961, I introduced a bill (S. 1939) to regulate the distribution of habit-forming barbiturate and amphetamine drugs.

This bill grew out of repeated hearings of the Senate Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, hearings that revealed the incredible increase of juvenile and adult addiction to what we call deadly drugs, amphetamines and barbiturates.

We found that more of these drugs were being peddled illegally than legitimately, and that inadequacies in the law were permitting this traffic to flourish.

During the past 16 months I have spread upon the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD instance after instance after instance of tragedy resulting from the illicit use of these deadly drugs. Under present conditions, the uncontrolled and virtually unrestricted use of these drugs is destroying the lives of thousands of young people who form a new class of drug addicts, and this new form of drug addiction is skyrocketing.

The solution to this problem is not easy. But a giant stride toward the solution can be made by amending the law to make possible realistic law enforcement. The sale of these drugs without a prescription is, of course, already illegal, but no effective and organized attack on these illegal sales can be made unless law enforcement officials know exactly where and in what quantities these drugs are being produced and to whom they are being shipped for resale.

S. 1939 meets this need by providing—

First, that manufacturers, compounders, and processors of barbiturates and amphetamines be required to register their names and addresses with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; second, that manufacturers and others engaged in receiving or disposing of such drugs be required to keep records of the quantities of such drugs they handle and make these records available to food and drug inspectors; and third, that adequate authority be given to drug inspectors to inspect establishments, inventory stocks, vehicles and other facilities relevant to the proper investigation of the disposal of drugs.

After this bill was introduced, our Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency held additional hearings on the drug problem. All parties concerned, including the law enforcement, the judicial and the legis-

lative branches of both State and Federal Governments, testified in favor of such legislation. The President of the United States has three times publicly recommended that the Congress enact this measure.

As the months lengthened into a year and then into a second year, I pressed more and more urgently for action on this bill, which was resting in a pigeon-hole in the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Resolutions of support came in from all quarters.

The Association of Juvenile Court Judges declared for the bill.

The International Juvenile Police Officers Association urged its enactment.

The Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association came out for it.

Distinguished representatives of a number of religious faiths recommended it.

Thousands of parents have written to me urging action on the bill.

Even the president of the largest producer of stimulant drugs endorsed this legislation.

Yet no committee action was scheduled on the bill. I wrote letter after letter to the chairman of the committee and to the other committee members. I sent a memorandum to the majority leader and the assistant majority leader. I buttonholed everyone who I thought could help me get action.

When told that committee consideration of the bill was being delayed pending a report from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, I called the then Secretary, Abraham Ribicoff, and secured his complete cooperation.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare reported favorably on S. 1939 on July 10, 1962. In its report, the Department suggested certain refinements and improvements in the bill.

To speed the legislative process further, I had a new bill drafted incorporating all of the recommendations of the Department except one controversial provision making mere possession of these drugs a crime.

When I again pressed for committee action, I was told that the committee was still waiting for a report on my second bill, which, as I have said, was a revision of the first bill designed to meet the recommendations outlined in the favorable report of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

So I again set to work. I called the new Secretary of HEW, Mr. Celebrezze, and with his wonderful cooperation my second amphetamine and barbiturate bill (S. 3673) was favorably reported on September 26, 1962.

Two weeks have passed since the submission of the second favorable report by HEW. During these 2 weeks I have again written to and spoken to committee members and have received such encouraging response that I am certain the bill would be passed if only action could be scheduled upon it. But as of this moment, it does not appear that the committee will schedule action.

I do not know what more I can do in behalf of this vital and relatively non-controversial measure.

This statement is made not in criticism, but in puzzlement. Here is a bill which tightens acknowledged inadequacies in the law, inadequacies which are permitting a wave of narcotic addiction to go unchecked in this country. This legislation has been publicly and repeatedly supported by the President of the United States. It has been supported by the only committee that has held hearings on the subject matter, the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee. It has the support of every group that knows anything about this problem. It has been asked for by police officials all over the country. It has been backed by every witness who testified before the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee, including three drug company presidents.

It has been approved by the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association. It has been twice favorably reported upon by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I do not know anyone who is against it.

The bill has been killed this year by inaction just as effectively as though it had been bitterly opposed.

The result is that another year will pass without action being taken to curb an abuse which is deplored by every thinking American who reflects upon it.

I earnestly hope that we will get a fresh start on this bill early next year and obtain prompt congressional action in order that we might stop the criminal traffic in amphetamines and barbiturates which is destroying the lives of thousands of new victims every month. Surely the Congress can find time for this.

#### TEMPORARY SUSPENSION OF DUTIES ON CORKBOARD INSULATION AND ON CORK STOPPERS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] I move that the Senate insist on its amendments to H.R. 12213 and request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. KERR, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, and Mr. CURTIS conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954 RELATIVE TO CERTAIN MANUFACTURERS' EXCISE TAXES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8952) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the conditions under which the special constructive sale price rule



is to apply for purposes of certain manufacturers' excise taxes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.  
(For conference report, see House proceedings of October 10, 1962, p. 23040, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the conference report be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

#### INCOME TAX TREATMENT OF TERMINAL RAILROAD CORPORATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12599) relating to the income tax treatment of terminal railroad corporations and their shareholders. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.  
(For conference report, see House proceedings of October 10, 1962, p. 23044, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the conference report be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

#### DESIGNATION OF CERTAIN CONTRACT CARRIERS AS CARRIERS OF BONDED MERCHANDISE—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5700) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to permit contract carriers by motor vehicle to transport bonded merchandise. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of October 10, 1962, p. 23039, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a statement by the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA  
I ask that the conference report on H.R. 5700 be accepted.

When this bill went to conference with a Senate amendment added we found that the House would not yield without certain changes in the amendment.

The Senate amendment had been added by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] to grant to common carriers engaged in coastwise trade the same privilege of withdrawing from warehouse their bunker fuel and certain other supplies without payment of tax as is now granted to vessels which travel from coast to coast or touch at foreign ports.

The point on which the difference hinged was that of expanding the import quotas on oil to provide that needed for the few ships engaged only in coastwise trade.

The Senate receded on the amendment. However, there was agreement that the principle was just and a solution could be had by providing that the amendment be limited to bunker fuel and the quotas for oil not be enlarged, but that the ships in question could still take from the present quota the oil needed without payment of the tax.

In order not to delay the bill H.R. 5700, it was proposed that Senator CURTIS attach his amended proposal to another bill before the Senate, and that was done on Friday, October 5. The amendment was offered to H.R. 10117 and was accepted by the Senate.

With that explanation of why the Senate receded, I ask that the conference report on H.R. 5700 be accepted.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the conference report be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

#### REAR ADM. CARL H. COTTER—AMENDMENT OF PRIVATE LAW 87-197

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2243, H.R. 9777.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 9777) to amend Private Law 87-197.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the committee report on H.R. 9777.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### PURPOSE

Private Law 87-197 relieved Rear Adm. Carl H. Cotter, U.S. Navy, retired, of liability to refund retired pay received during a stated period and to authorize the payment of amounts withheld in connection with the same matter. The bill H.R. 9777 would correct the period covered by changing the closing date from July 31, 1959, to November 30, 1959, and to amend the first sentence of section 2 of the law, so as to make it clear that the amount to be paid under the law is to include the balance of retired pay otherwise due during the period in question.

#### STATEMENT

The facts in connection with this matter are set forth in House Report No. 2474 on H.R. 9777, and are as follows:

"In its report to the committee on H.R. 9777, the Department of the Navy has indicated that it has no objection to the purpose of the bill, that of amending Private Law 87-197 to provide full relief to Rear Admiral Cotter.

"Private Law 87-197 was enacted to extend relief in a situation where a decision by the Comptroller General imposed liability upon Rear Admiral Cotter on the ground that payment of his retired pay was barred for a certain period by section 6112(b) of title 10, United States Code, which provides that if a retired officer of the Regular Navy or the Regular Marine Corps is engaged for himself or others in selling, or contracting or negotiating to sell, naval supplies or war materials to the Department of the Navy, he is not entitled to any payment from the United States while he is so engaged.

"Rear Admiral Cotter retired from the Navy in 1947. Several years later he was president of a construction corporation when it entered into two contracts with the Navy in 1956 and 1957 to extend and reinforce runways and to build new taxiways and various airport development projects at the U.S. Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, P.R. The contracts contained agreements to furnish all labor, equipment, and materials in connection with constructing the airfield improvements. Rear Admiral Cotter, as president of the corporation, signed one contract and the proposals for both contracts. He accepted two change orders to the contracts. He reportedly took no part in the negotiations leading to the contracts and change orders. Invitations to bid on both contracts were publicly advertised and extensively circulated among contractors. Rear Admiral Cotter's firm was the lowest bidder of eight, in one instance, and of four in the other. There have been no suggestions of improper influence or fraud regarding the contracts.

"On August 24, 1959, the Department of the Navy referred to the Comptroller General the question whether Rear Admiral Cotter was entitled to retired pay in view of his activities in connection with the contracts. At the same time the Navy suspended payments of his retired pay pending the decision of the Comptroller General.

"The Judge Advocate General of the Navy, in an opinion dated August 13, 1956, had held that the signing of contracts constituted contracting to sell under 10 U.S.C. 6112(b). The Comptroller General had held that any article of tangible personal property purchased by the Department of the Navy was within the purview of the phrase 'naval supplies or war materials' in 10 U.S.C. 6112(b) (38 Comp. Gen. 470, 1959). The issues in doubt in Rear Admiral Cotter's case, therefore, were (1) whether public works and improvements were 'naval supplies or war materials,' and (2) if so, during what period had Rear Admiral Cotter been engaged in

selling or contracting to sell those supplies or materials.

"The Comptroller General ruled, in decision B-140581 dated November 9, 1959, that the officer was not entitled to retired pay during the period his firm was obligated to perform, or was engaged in performing, the Navy contracts. Rear Admiral Cotter then resigned his position with the construction company effective November 30, 1959. Private Law 87-197 relieved the officer of liability to pay the amount representing the overpayments of retired pay during the period beginning May 1, 1956, and ending July 31, 1959. His retired pay had been suspended, however, for the 4 months following July 31, 1959, pending the Comptroller General's decision, while he was still connected with the construction company. To that extent the private law, evidently through a misunderstanding, failed to provide a full measure of relief. H.R. 9777 seeks to provide full relief by amending the private law to extend the time period involved to November 30, 1959. The Comptroller General in his decision on Rear Admiral Cotter's case stated that he should not, by giving a strict and narrow interpretation to the term 'naval supplies or war materials,' foreclose the courts from considering and determining the scope of that term as used in 10 U.S.C. 6112(b). The Comptroller General recognized, however, that the activities of this officer were not clearly within the restrictions of the statute as shown by the following statement:

"Congress, it is true, by using the term 'naval supplies or war materials,' in 10 U.S.C. 6112, did not cast the statute in terms having clear literal application to the situation here involved—sales activities relating to public buildings and works (39 Comp. Gen. 366, 368)."

"It was through an expanded interpretation of the law, therefore, that Rear Admiral Cotter was required to forfeit his retired pay, for activities not clearly within the statutory restrictions.

"The Department of the Navy has interposed no objection to the relief proposed in the bill H.R. 9777. However, that Department pointed out that the bill would have to be amended in order to effectuate its purpose. In this connection, the Navy stated:

"The Department of the Navy interposes no objection to the purpose of H.R. 9777, to provide full relief to Rear Admiral Cotter. The bill in its present form, however, would not restore this officer to full entitlement to retired pay for the 4 months following July 31, 1959. Private Law 87-197 provided for relief from liability arising from overpayments of retired pay. Even after extension of the time period involved, the private law would not authorize payment of full retired pay to Rear Admiral Cotter for the months August through November 1959, for no overpayments were made during that period. This defect could be cured by adding to H.R. 9777 a provision to amend Private Law 87-197 further by inserting the following words after the last word in the first sentence of section 2 of the private law: 'and in addition such amounts as represent the balance of retired pay otherwise due for the above period.'"

"This committee agrees that this amendment is necessary and, therefore, has recommended the addition of a new section 2 to the bill embodying the language suggested by the Department.

"In view of the congressional intent expressed in the passage of the private law, the circumstances of the case, and the position of the Department of the Navy as expressed in its report, this committee recommends that the amended bill be considered favorably."

After consideration of all of the foregoing, the committee concurs in the action taken

by the House of Representatives and recommends that the bill, H.R. 9777, be considered favorably.

#### TYRANNY AT THE TOP—ACTIVITIES OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN MISSISSIPPI

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, there has come to my attention a thought-provoking editorial which appeared in the Statesville Record and Landmark, of Statesville, N.C., on October 2, 1962. Irrespective of the way any Senator feels about the recent unfortunate occurrences in Mississippi, I believe this editorial presents several questions which deserve the most serious consideration of each Member of the Congress and of every American citizen. I submit the editorial entitled "Tyranny at the Top" and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the Record as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

##### TYRANNY AT THE TOP

The excesses to which the Federal Government is going today in the State of Mississippi paint an impressive picture of what lies at the end of the road down which we are traveling—big government and little men.

Fifteen thousand troops—two soldiers for every civilian—sent into a community, unarmed, unorganized and untrained, to enforce judicial decrees upholding the civil rights of a single individual.

In the process, the rights of thousands of other Americans are being violated.

No martial law having been declared, Oxford, Miss., and the university campus are still under civil authority. Thus, every resident of the community is entitled to exercise the basic American rights, freedom of speech, freedom of movement, the right to assemble and petition.

Item: An ex-general of the U.S. Army is arrested 1 mile from the scene of the trouble and charged with inciting to riot. Although presumed innocent until convicted by a jury, he is slapped under \$100,000 bond and spirited by plane many miles to prison in another State.

Law: Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted. Article 8, U.S. Constitution.

Item: Automobiles of private citizens are stopped and searched by troops placed throughout the community. One man reported being stopped and searched several times during a trip to the airport.

Law: The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrant shall issue but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched and the person or things to be seized. Article 4, U.S. Constitution.

Item: Citizens within a wide area surrounding Oxford have been halted, searched and their arms confiscated.

Law: \* \* \* the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed. Article 2, U.S. Constitution.

Item: Tear gas shells fired by U.S. troops and Federal marshals have driven the people of Oxford from their homes and their places of business.

Law: The right of persons to be secure in their \* \* \* houses \* \* \* shall not be infringed. Article 4, U.S. Constitution.

There are many other examples, particularly relating to the treatment of individuals apprehended by the troops and marshals. Many have been forced to stand against the wall, hands over heads; all have been herded into an outdoor compound, to be held there until the \* \* \* [Federal Government] \* \* \* decides how to proceed against them.

This is in sharp contrast with the tender care which must be extended by State and local officers to the most hardened offenders. It is also in sharp contrast to the reserved, dignified treatment extended mobs in Albany, Ga., who were being egged on by troublemakers with direct telephone lines into the Department of Justice if not the White House itself. Yet, if the State of Georgia in trying to preserve law and order had resorted to any of the techniques now being applied to the citizens of Oxford, the Federal courts would throw the cases out faster than they could be presented.

All of this raises serious questions. Why is it any worse for a Ross Barnett to encourage the violation of a Federal law with which he disagrees than for the President of the United States, through public statements, and his brother, the Attorney General, through telephoned advice, to egg on mobs bent on violating State law in Georgia?

Why is it worse for the police in Statesville, to use night sticks in apprehending individuals inciting a mob to action against private citizens than it is for Federal authorities to use the ultimate in force in Mississippi?

And, more important still, who is going to protect the rights of the innocent, the private citizen who merely wants to go about his business, in Oxford or Albany?

The Federal Government has now demonstrated again that it will go to the limit enforcing rights based on color? How far will it go enforcing rights not based on color, such as the right to work of several thousand Californians now being deprived of their jobs because they do not want to belong to a union?

Who, in the last analysis, will stand between the lowly citizen and tyranny, not at the State and local level, but at the top? No doubt the British were talking about law and order when an earlier generation of Bostonians was dumping tea.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I read the first paragraph of the editorial, already printed in the Record, which is as follows:

The excesses to which the Federal Government is going today in the State of Mississippi paint an impressive picture of what lies at the end of the road down which we are traveling—big government and little men.

The vital question stated by the North Carolina editor is in the closing paragraphs of the editorial, and is as follows:

Who is going to protect the rights of the innocent, the private citizen who merely wants to go about his business \* \* \* .

The Federal Government has now demonstrated again that it will go to the limit enforcing rights based on color? How far will it go enforcing rights not based on color, such as the right to work of several thousand Californians now being deprived of their jobs because they do not want to belong to a union?

Who, in the last analysis, will stand between the lowly citizen and tyranny, not at the State and local level, but at the top?

Mr. President, as a southern Senator who is by no means an extremist in the field of civil rights and racial matters, I feel that it is timely for all Americans



to consider whether, in the zeal for enforcement of civil rights in one field, our Government has so far forgotten its obligation to sustain the civil rights of American citizens in other fields as to overrun and to violate many such rights.

Mr. President, I have noted from the editorials of many other papers that other able editorialists than the one in Statesville, N.C., are concerned with this question. Without quoting from the several available from my own State and elsewhere, I noted with interest in the lead editorial of the Sunday Star published yesterday right here in the Nation's Capital, an able discussion of one of these issues under the title "General Walker Insane?" which I ask unanimous consent to have included in full as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### GENERAL WALKER INSANE?

The Department of Justice insists it has adhered faithfully to the law in confining former Major General Walker to a mental institution. Maybe so. But if this is correct, the law affords no visible protection to an individual in General Walker's situation.

He was arrested last Monday on serious charges in connection with the riot at the University of Mississippi. Taken before a U.S. Commissioner, he was advised of his legal rights. General Walker waived his right to counsel and to a preliminary hearing. He was assured that he would be tried in Mississippi on the charges against him, and bail was set at \$100,000. With that, he was flown to a Federal prison hospital in Springfield, Mo., with every reason to believe that he would be eligible for release on bail when he got there.

General Walker didn't know that the Department of Justice on the following day would bring mental commitment proceedings against him in Mississippi which would result in his being denied release on bail in Missouri. In fact, it is not clear when the decision to seek commitment was made. But it must have been made not later than about noon on Tuesday. An hour earlier, according to Representative ALGER, of Texas, he was being assured by the Attorney General personally that General Walker's transfer to Springfield "had no connection with the fact that there is a mental hospital connected with that prison." He was also assured, Mr. ALGER told the House, that there would be no barrier to General Walker's release if he posted the bail fixed by the court.

Meanwhile, the wheels were turning swiftly in Washington. Someone decided that the general should be committed for mental observation at Springfield. The chief psychiatrist of the Federal Prison Bureau prepared an affidavit for submission to a Federal judge in Mississippi—not in Missouri, where General Walker was.

This affidavit is an interesting document. Its essential conclusion is that General Walker's recent behavior "may be indicative of an underlying mental disturbance." The basis for his conclusion, the psychiatrist said, was a reading of newspaper stories, unspecified "indications" in an unidentified "medical history," and "other information" of an undisclosed nature "available to me."

Armed with this flimsy weapon, the U.S. Attorney in Mississippi, doubtless on instructions from Washington, appeared before Federal Judge Claude Clayton, sitting in Oxford. The attorney told the judge that on the basis of the information from the psychiatrist, he had "reasonable cause" to believe that General Walker may be presently insane or so mentally incompetent as to be unable

to understand the nature of the proceedings against him or to properly assist in his own defense. With this, the judge signed the commitment papers, and the U.S. Attorney in Springfield thereupon said that General Walker would be held for from 60 to 90 days for mental examination and that he could not be released on bail.

It is important to note, we think, that the sole question is whether the general, who certainly has offered no defense of insanity, is able to understand the nature of the proceedings against him and to assist in his own defense. Without in any way condoning his behavior, we have seen nothing which indicates that he lacks this degree of mental capacity. And we do not think that this inference is overcome by an undocumented conclusion that he "may be" suffering from "an underlying mental disturbance"—whatever that means.

This is a question, however, which must be decided in the courts. And, thanks to the availability of the writ of habeas corpus, the Department of Justice must show cause in Springfield on Tuesday why General Walker should not be released on bond. Beyond that, the Department has been ordered by a Springfield Federal court to certify the "true cause" of General Walker's detention. The full story of the Walker case should be developed in the course of these proceedings.

Meanwhile, there is ample reason, we think, to be concerned over a procedure under which an accused man can reasonably believe on one day that he will be released on bail, only to discover 24 hours later that he has been committed to a mental institution, without right of bail, on the statement of a psychiatrist who had never examined him and by a judge who had never seen him.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Star editorialist makes it very clear that he in no way condones the behavior of General Walker, but he closes with this interesting, compelling paragraph:

Meanwhile, there is ample reason, we think, to be concerned over a procedure under which an accused man can reasonably believe on one day that he will be released on bail, only to discover 24 hours later that he has been committed to a mental institution, without right of bail, on the statement of a psychiatrist who had never examined him and by a judge who had never seen him.

#### RICHARD C. COLLINS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2228, H.R. 3131.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 3131) for the relief of Richard C. Collins.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there is no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

#### AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954—MEDICAL AND OTHER BENEFITS FOR RETIRED EMPLOYEES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10117) to amend sec-

tion 401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to provide that plans which provide certain medical and other benefits for retired employees and their families may be qualified pension plans.

#### AUBURN-FOLSOM SOUTH UNIT, CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on the 7th of August 1962, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs favorably reported the bill S. 103, which my distinguished colleague from California [Mr. ENGLE] and I jointly authored.

In these closing days or hours of the session, with not very many Senators present, some of whom would oppose the proposed reclamation project for the State of California—parenthetically I observe that the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] is presiding—I am not unmindful of the difficulties in having a debate on the measure this year.

My California colleague [Mr. ENGLE] would join me completely in what I have said. Let the record show that I have tried to find him. He is busily engaged in a conference meeting at the moment.

I should like to ask the majority leader, for the record, assuming the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs repeats next year its action of this year and reports to the Senate a bill similar to S. 103, which would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Auburn-Folsom south unit on the American River as part of the Central Valley project in California under Federal reclamation law, could the distinguished majority leader indicate whether or not he would look with favor upon having an early debate in the 1963 session on our most important California reclamation project?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to say to the acting minority leader that I not only would look upon the project with favor, but with approval. I shall do my very best to bring the measure to the floor of the Senate as quickly as possible in the next session. Of course, the bill would have to be reported from the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, of which the Senator from California is one of the outstanding members. I am sure that the measure could be handled in the committee. If he will do his part there, as I know he will, I shall do my part in the Policy Committee and on the floor of the Senate to be of assistance.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my friend. As I said a moment ago, my colleague had been detained in a conference committee. I see him now in the Chamber. As I said earlier, and repeat now, we both hope that an expeditious hearing can be given in the next session of Congress to the project, assuming, of course, that the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs repeats its action approving the measure at the next session.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE. I agree with the sentiment expressed in relation to the measure. I am an author of the Auburn-Folsom proposed legislation. It is a bill that involves a substantial amount of money.

Although I would like to have the precedent of Senate action on the proposed legislation at this session, I am aware that the House has not even held hearings, and the possibilities of action in the House at this time are remote to the point of being invisible. Rather than bring the measure up now, it seems to me that the more prudent course would be to let it go over, with the understanding that if we obtain favorable action again by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as I think we shall, our distinguished majority leader will help us to bring it before the Senate for debate at an early time so that the House will have sufficient time to act upon the measure at the next session of Congress. I thank my distinguished leader for yielding to me.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The California Senators have my utmost assurance.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my friend.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

#### MOBILE TRADE FAIRS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3389) to promote the foreign commerce of the United States through the use of mobile trade fairs. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a brief explanation of the conference report.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There can no longer be any doubt but that the United States has failed in recent years to take full advantage of the foreign trade opportunities which are available around the globe. The present administration has pledged itself to stem the flow of gold from our shores, and has placed maximum emphasis on increasing our exports to achieve this aim.

In this committee's study of foreign trade, we heard a great deal of support for an export expansion program from the business community. One of the methods proposed and discussed concerned the use of mobile trade fairs.

I introduced this bill because I felt it would provide an important media for exhibiting our products, with the initiative

being taken by private enterprise and not by the Government.

The response received from business firms all over the United States has been gratifying. Their endorsement of a mobile trade fair program is obviously essential for its success.

I urge the approval of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

#### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, that it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### THIS YEAR'S FARM BILL PUTS OUR FEET TO FIRE ON MANDATORY CONTROLS NEXT YEAR

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, during consideration of the farm bill this year, and especially during consideration of the conference report, some of us argued that if the farm bill were passed, next year those of us who are very concerned about mandatory controls on feed grains would find our "feet to the fire" and would find it extremely difficult to resist mandatory controls. That was my position.

In yesterday's issue of the New York Times there appeared an Associated Press article entitled "Kennedy Gambles on Farm Program." I quote from the Associated Press article:

Failing to get the House to approve a control program, administration leaders set to work to make the old program less acceptable in the hope that next year's Congress would approve permanent controls, beginning in 1964.

The article continues:

In other words, the minimum support under the administration's new law is 80 cents a bushel for corn. This compares with a minimum of \$1.05 that would have prevailed if the act of 1958 had been left unchanged.

As a consequence, when Congress takes up farm legislation next year, the administration will be in a position to say that if permanent controls are not authorized, the corn supports would have to be cut back to 80 cents.

The administration is confident that Congress, faced with this choice, will finally agree, however reluctantly, to approve the administration's program of controls.

Mr. President, that is a very real threat. I am concerned on two scores. First, Congress may not go along with that program, in which case we would have disastrously low prices for corn, which in turn would mean depression-low prices for hogs, beef, milk, and so forth.

Second, if a mandatory controls program were adopted by Congress, farmers will very likely vote them down at least the first year or two. The result will be

real chaos and a very expensive mess to clean up. It would be tough, mighty tough, on the taxpayers as well as on the farmer. I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Kennedy Gambles on Farm Program," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### KENNEDY GAMBLING ON FARM PROGRAM—MAKES PLAN LESS PALATABLE TO GAIN NEW CONTROLS

WASHINGTON, October 6.—The Kennedy administration has taken a calculated risk in the new farm act that may or may not pay off next year.

The gamble is on the livestock feed grain program, starting in 1964, which the administration succeeded in obtaining despite the reluctance of Congress.

From the standpoint of most growers this program is so much worse than the one it will replace that the administration believes the next Congress will pass a new one more to its liking.

The administration wants authority to invoke, with the farmers' approval, controls on production of feed grains as well as of other farm products affected from time to time by surpluses.

These controls, which the administration refers to as supply management, would be intended to stabilize production at levels necessary to meet all demands and maintain a safe reserve.

#### REJECTED BY CONGRESS

Congress refused to approve such controls for the feed grains this year. Many Senators and Representatives contended that the legislation enacted in 1958 under the Eisenhower administration would operate satisfactorily to stabilize feed grains if it were allowed to function.

This law removed acreage allotments from corn, the major feed grain. It also set price supports at 90 percent of the average market price during the previous 3 years. This allowed a lower support rate than had prevailed under previous legislation. Advocates said it would tend to discourage overproduction and bring about a balance between supplies and requirements.

But the Kennedy administration refused to go along with this program. It set up in 1961, continued this year and got Congress to extend through next year, a program that offers grain producers payments for leaving a part of their feed grain land idle and price supports on their production.

Failing to get the House to approve a control program, administration leaders set to work to make the old program less acceptable in the hope that next year's Congress would approve permanent controls, beginning in 1964.

#### SUPPORTS LESS PALATABLE

The act of 1958 was amended to make its price supports less palatable. The amendment requires the Secretary of Agriculture to set feed grain supports at between 50 and 90 percent of parity, a formula devised to give farmers a fair market price in comparison with their costs of production. But the price level must be set so that it will not result in adding more feed grain stocks to the surplus.

In other words, the minimum support under the administration's new law is 80 cents a bushel for corn. This compares with a minimum of \$1.05 that would have prevailed if the act of 1958 had been left unchanged.

As a consequence, when Congress takes up farm legislation next year, the administration will be in a position to say that if permanent controls are not authorized, the corn supports would have to be cut back to 80 cents.



The administration is confident that Congress, faced with this choice, will finally agree, however reluctantly, to approve the administration's program of controls.

### UNCONSCIONABLE WASTE IN THE SPACE PROGRAM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have been deeply concerned with the cost of the space program. I enthusiastically support the drive to be first in space, and particularly to beat the Russians to the moon. It is important that we do that. At the same time there has been great waste in the program which should be eliminated. One flagrant example of waste is in the spending on the space flight center at Houston, which originally was to cost \$60 million, but for which this year we had to appropriate \$91 million.

I notice in an article by William Hines in the Sunday Star that one present estimate of the ultimate cost of this center is not \$60 million or \$90 million or \$120 million, but \$200 million.

This is unconscionable. I plead with the administrators of the National Space Agency to give real consideration to cutting down this very rapidly climbing cost.

I ask unanimous consent that this article may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### NASA RENTS LUXURY HAVEN FOR ASTRONAUTS' QUARTERS

(By William Hines, Star Science Writer)

HOUSTON, TEX., October 6.—The space agency has taken over a fancy apartment complex here as "working quarters" for the astronauts.

For at least a year, starting about November 1, the 15 fliers will temper the rigors of space flight training in carpeted, air-conditioned surroundings, which are frankly billed on a sign out front as "luxury apartments."

Other amenities include cutglass chandeliers, curving wrought-iron stairways, balconies and a landscaped courtyard complete with a 50-foot swimming pool. The layout will cost the taxpayers about \$185,000 for a single year's occupancy, or slightly more than the total pay and allowances drawn by the 15 spacemen in a similar period.

#### REPORTER LEARNS OF SITE

This rental—based on 50,000 square feet of space at an estimated average of \$3.70 a square foot—reportedly equals about one-third of the builder's \$500,000 investment. It also amounts to about 1½ times what apartment dwellers will pay per square foot for living quarters in two other buildings in the same development.

The space agency's Manned Spacecraft Center did not have much to say today about the transaction beyond the fact that a contract had been entered into. In fact, in announcing the contract last week, MSC referred to the rental of office space in the "Franklin Development Center."

An alert reporter on the Houston Chronicle had never heard of the particular development center, which he thought might possibly be one of scores springing up like mushrooms in this exploding Texas metropolis of 1 million people. He asked for the address, and after some prodding was told it was located at 2510 Beatty Street, about 5 miles south of the city and within sight of the Manned Spacecraft Center headquarters.

#### FIFTY THOUSAND SQUARE FEET

The Chronicle reporter—like out-of-townners who inspected the location today—

found it to be the "Franklin Luxury Apartments," according to the sign in the front yard.

Inside, contractors and NASA technicians were working overtime to get the quarters ready for occupancy.

An employee of Joseph L. Smith and Associates, owner of the project, said the Manned Spacecraft Center would occupy 50,000 of the 67,000-square-foot total in six buildings. The two buildings reserved for private tenants consists of 26 one-bedroom apartments which will rent for \$125-a-month each, utilities included, he said.

Thus, private renters will pay \$39,000 a year for 17,000 square feet or about \$2.30 a square foot while the Space Agency will pay about \$3.70 a square foot.

#### OCCUPY 14 SITES

The builder's spokesman explained, however, that private renters will not be allowed to use the swimming pool in the balcony-lined, tree-shaded courtyard.

The Manned Spacecraft Center said the building will house, in addition to the astronauts and their rapidly growing staff of aids, the executive offices of the Center's spacecraft research division and a technical library.

The move constitutes a substantial improvement in astronaut working quarters over the days at Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Va., when seven of them shared one medium-sized room in a crowded office building.

The Manned Spacecraft Center now occupies about 14 sites in rented buildings around Houston, ranging from old warehouses through moderate-to-fancy apartments to such luxury layouts as the paneled and patioed Farnsworth-Chambers Building, which serves as Center headquarters.

#### MORE LAND NEEDED

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration is now building permanent facilities for the Center on a tract of land about 25 miles southeast of Houston. The land originally acquired came as a gift from Rice University, but it is now understood that more land will have to be acquired for cash on the booming real estate market.

Originally built as a \$60-million construction job, the Center's appropriation through fiscal 1963 is \$91 million, and estimates of the probable total cost run as high as \$200 million. Occupancy is scheduled to begin in the calendar year 1964.

Most of the seven original astronauts bought houses near the new Center after a deal to get homes free fell through under newspaper pressure last May. These spacemen, whose investment funds derive principally from a \$500,000 personal-story contract with Life magazine, revealed yesterday they were planning to divest themselves of interests in a plush motel near Cape Canaveral, Fla.

### EXPANSION OF NASA PUBLICITY PROGRAM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in the same connection I must say that an expert job of public relations is being done on the part of our Space Agency. I recognize that our astronauts are to be applauded. They are real heroes, and they are showing great courage. I was interested to know how much was being spent for public relations in connection with our space program. I wrote to NASA and asked them to give me a report. Such a report has been sent to me. I note that the personnel in the Office of the Assistant Administrator for Public Affairs has increased from five in 1962 to seven in fiscal year 1963.

In the Office of Educational Programs and Services of NASA, personnel have increased from 22 in 1961 to 26 in 1962 to 73 in 1963.

In Office of Public Services and Administration of NASA, personnel have increased from 22 in 1961 to 26 in 1962 to 28 in 1963.

I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR FOR PUBLIC AFFAIRS

This Office was established in January 1962 to direct and coordinate all public-affairs activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The following data apply to the Office of the Assistant Administrator for Public Affairs:

	Fiscal year 1962	Fiscal year 1963 (planned)
Personnel.....	5	7
Annual personnel salary rates.....	\$51,230	\$73,410
Operating funds.....	\$5,600	\$8,500

#### OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS AND SERVICES

This Office conducts a variety of programs aimed at improving scientific education and the scientific literacy of the Nation. These programs are carried out in cooperation with or at the request of organized entities of the education community such as the U.S. Office of Education, National Science Foundation, National Education Association, National Science Teachers Association, State departments of education, etc.

Among the programs conducted are: The spacemobile program, a traveling science demonstration principally for elementary, junior and senior high schools; space science symposiums for teachers; development of classroom instruction materials; assistance in curriculum development; educational publications; films on NASA programs and assistance to State departments of education. This Office also is responsible for a comprehensive exhibits program, the NASA historical program, and the preparation of the semi-annual report to Congress. The following data apply to the Office of Educational Programs and Services:

	Fiscal year 1961	Fiscal year 1962	Fiscal year 1963 (planned)
Personnel.....	27	57	73
Annual salary rates.....	\$221,998	\$520,390	\$670,067
Operating funds.....	\$780,759	\$3,320,582	\$9,271,000
Spacemobile units.....	2	13	20
Space science symposiums.....	50	175	225
Classroom materials.....	0	6	33

<sup>1</sup> Estimated.

	Fiscal year 1961	Fiscal year 1962	Fiscal year 1963 (planned)
Assistance in curriculum development (instances).....	15	35	70
Educational publications.....	3	19	30
Assistance to State departments of education (instances).....	10	34	75
Exhibit requests received.....	68	235	2,200
Exhibits turned down.....	22	79	1,213
Exhibits scheduled.....	46	206	887

## OFFICE OF PUBLIC SERVICES AND INFORMATION

This Office coordinates public information operations throughout the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. It provides services to all news media by providing information on NASA activities. The office prepares information plans on major operations, develops press kits, coordinates public affairs requirements of the NASA program offices, prepares press releases, answers media representative inquiries, provides photographic coverage of operations and provides to news media audio visual material such as color and black and white prints, slides, film clips, and tapes of voice transmissions. Other major activities include arranging interviews with key NASA officials, conducting press conferences and coordinating news media coverage of major launches at which up to 500 news media representatives are involved. The following data apply to the Office of Public Services and Information:

	Fiscal year 1961	Fiscal year 1962	Fiscal year 1963 (planned)
Personnel.....	22	26	28
Annual personnel salary rates.....	\$199,343	\$237,565	\$260,624
Operating funds.....	\$203,800	\$232,902	\$286,000
Press releases.....	1,249	319	350
Photographic requests.....	14,584	4,709	5,500
Prints released.....	161,640	282,238	322,000
Items cleared for release (contractor release, advertising copy, etc.).....	1,678	754	830
Interviews arranged.....	1,396	1,110	1,400

<sup>1</sup> Estimated.

# MILWAUKEE'S RALPH VOTAPEK WINS INTERNATIONAL PIANIST AWARD, ONE OF THE WORLD'S GREATEST

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, on Saturday night a distinguished American artist was recognized in the Van Cliburn competition, at Houston, Tex. This was a worldwide competition, including some of the greatest piano artists from Russia and Japan and many other foreign countries.

I am proud to say that an American won that competition. The American who won it is from Milwaukee, Wis. He is Ralph Votapek. He gave a magnificent performance. I have talked to several critics since the contest, and I have been told that this young man, who is 23 years of age, is bound to be one of the great artists of the world. I am proud of his achievement. I ask unanimous consent that two articles, one published in the New York Times and the other in the Washington Post, be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times]

WISCONSIN PIANIST AWARDED \$10,000—23-YEAR-OLD, FACING DRAFT, WINS CLIBURN CONTEST

(By Raymond Ericson)

FORT WORTH, October 7.—While 42,000 cheering football enthusiasts watched the University of Arkansas Razorbacks trounce the Texas Christian University Horned Frogs last night, a few hundred music lovers waited tensely in a hall a few blocks away for the outcome of the Van Cliburn International Piano Competition.

Early this morning it was announced that Ralph Votapek, a 23-year-old pianist from Milwaukee, had won the \$10,000 first prize, probably the largest ever given a performing artist in the United States.

This was the first American contest in which Soviet pianists had taken part, and Russians placed second and third. They were Nikolai Petrov, 19, who won \$5,000, and Mikhail Voskresensky, 27, who won \$2,000.

Cécile Ousset, a 26-year-old Parisian, was awarded the fourth prize of \$1,000, and Marilyn Neeley, a 25-year-old Californian from Glendale, the fifth prize of \$750.

Prizes of \$500 each went to Sergio Varrella Cid of Portugal, Arthur Fennimore of Berwyn, Pa., and Takashi Hironaka and Miss Hiroko Nakamura of Japan.

## CHAMBER PRIZE SPLIT

The \$600 for the best performance of chamber music during the semifinals was divided between Miss Nakamura and Mr. Votapek. Mr. Fennimore won a \$500 gold watch for the best performance during the preliminaries of Lee Holby's Capriccio on Five Notes, which was commissioned from the American composer for the contest.

Ironically, Mr. Votapek may not be able to accept the many extra benefits that go with his cash prize. He received notice 3 weeks ago from his draft board to report for induction into the Army next Friday in Milwaukee.

The perquisites would include a Carnegie Hall recital on December 5, a contract with S. Hurok for an American tour, a contract for a European tour, appearances with several orchestras including the National Symphony of Mexico, and an appearance and a recording with the Paganini Quartet.

RCA Victor is taking an option on a recording contract with Mr. Votapek.

As second-place winner, Mr. Petrov has been invited to give a recital in the University of Minnesota's artist course and to appear as soloist with the Minneapolis Symphony.

The official presentation of the prizes, with medals and certificates, was made this afternoon after a recital by Mr. Votapek in the Ed Landreth Auditorium on the TCU campus, where the contest was held.

The awards were announced early this morning after the third section of the finals. As in each of the earlier sections, three contestants played concertos with the Fort Worth Symphony Orchestra. They were Mr. Cid, Mr. Hironaka and Miss Nakamura. She had been ill for 2 days and made a brave but faltering effort to appear.

Only 18, and looking delectable in a beautiful Japanese kimono, Miss Nakamura was able to finish the first movement of Beethoven's Third Concerto but was then forced to cancel her scheduled performance of the Rachmaninoff Rhapsody on a Theme by Paganini.

Neither of the other artists played as well in the finals as any of the previous contestants had.

## INTERNATIONAL JURY

The winners were announced by Leopold Mannes, chairman of the jury, which comprised musicians from Europe, the Soviet Union, Japan, Central and South America and the United States. Mr. Mannes was introduced by Mrs. Grace Ward Lankford, general chairman of the competition and the driving force behind it.

Mr. Mannes said the judges' decisions were based on "capacity, talent and potential." The final tallies included the scores earned by the contestants in the preliminaries and the semifinals.

Audience approval of the judges' decisions was wildly enthusiastic, as far as the first two winners were concerned. These had largely been expected after the brilliant performances Mr. Votapek and Mr. Petrov gave in the finals. Nor was there criticism of the

placement of the other finalists, although judges and spectators had personal preferences in how they should have been ranked.

## VICTOR IS COMPOSED

Mr. Votapek, a good-looking, blond, spectacled youth, received the announcement with the smiling, quiet composure that is characteristic of him.

While the concertos were being played, he went to the football game—"The first I've been able to attend since college," he said. The only excitement he displayed came as soon as photographers would let him leave the stage. Then he rushed off to a booth to telephone his mother in Milwaukee.

"I hadn't really expected to win the contest when I entered it," he said afterward, "especially after I learned that some Russians would take part. My mother, who has more confidence in me than I do, hoped I might place third or second, but even she was surprised when I told her that I had won."

"I hope the draft board will give me some kind of reprieve so I can take advantage of the concert appearances they scheduled for the winner. I know that they are going to try to do something in Washington about it."

## ROSINA LHEVINNE'S PUPIL

Coincidentally, Mr. Votapek has been studying for the last year with Rosina Lhevinne, who also taught Van Cliburn, in whose honor the competition was named. But Mr. Votapek had never met his famous colleague, who is only a few years his senior, until he came to Fort Worth 2 weeks ago.

Mr. Votapek's previous teachers have been Guy Mombaerts at Northwestern University and Robert Goldsand at the Manhattan School of Music. In 1959 he won the Rudolph Ganz Award in Chicago and in 1961 the Naumburg Award in New York. Also in 1961 he placed fourth in the Mitropoulos International Competition. This year he was among the five finalists in the Leventritt Competition.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 8, 1962]  
VOTAPEK PIANO VICTORY WAS NO SURPRISE

(By Paul Hume)

It was 12:07 a.m., Fort Worth time, on Sunday morning, that Ralph Votapek was named winner of the \$10,000 first prize in the first Cliburn International Quadrennial Piano Competition.

The 23-year-old pianist from Milwaukee, Wis., won a clear victory, one that was predicted in the Washington Post several hours before it became official. His playing had consistently shown superb style, taste, and excitement during his three appearances during the contest. Last December, Votapek placed fourth in the Mitropoulos Competition in New York City.

The Soviet Union's two strong contenders in the finals, Nikolai Petrov and Mikhail Voskresenski, carried off the second and third prizes of \$5,000 and \$2,000 respectively. Both artists had been greatly admired throughout the contest.

Cécile Ousset, France's glamorous entry, who played her concertos in the finals with tinted glasses to reduce the glare of bright lights on the keyboard, won the fourth prize of \$1,000. Fifth place went to Marilyn Neeley of Glendale, Calif., and sixth, seventh, eighth, and ninth-place prizes of \$500 each went to Sergio Varella Cid of Portugal, Arthur Fennimore of Berwyn, Pa., Takashi Hironaka and Hiroko Nakamura of Japan. Fennimore also won the special \$500 gold watch for the best performance of Lee Holby's Capriccio on Five Notes, a work required of all the contestants.

The \$600 prize for the best performance of chamber music, given by Van Cliburn, was divided, thanks to an absolute tie, to the fourth decimal place, between Miss Nakamura and top-winner Votapek.



Unexpected drama came in the last night of the contest when Miss Nakamura, who had been ill for 2 days, played the required Beethoven movement, colorful in a kimono of red and blue on white, with a gold obi, and then almost fainted and could not complete her part in the finals.

The judges had already placed her, with Votapek, at the top of the list in playing chamber music, and awarded her the ninth-place prize of \$500 despite her inability to finish the finals.

Even before the decisions were announced, Votapek had been signed to an optional recording contract with RCA Victor. He is now in line for a worldwide tour, both as a solo artist and with orchestras. He also has been notified by his draft board to report to the U.S. Army next Friday morning. This is the time for an official pronouncement exempting him so that he can perform the service for this country for which he is most eminently qualified, that of acting as our newest, and one of our most gifted ambassadors in the arts to the whole world.

#### BEST ADVICE TO YOUTH: GET ALL THE EDUCATION YOU CAN

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have introduced a resolution in Congress to urge State governments to require that young people stay in school until they are 17.

Recently the Washington News published a very fine editorial entitled "Learning Really Pays." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

##### LEARNING REALLY PAYS

"Gosh, Pa, why do I have to finish school? Why can't I quit and go to work?"

Any parent hearing such questions from his teenage offspring would do well—after reading junior the customary riot act—to look at the latest nationwide job report.

While the unemployment rate for all workers still is fairly high (5.8 percent), it is 2½ times above the average for youths 14 to 19. Out of every 100 teenagers hunting a job last month, more than 13 couldn't find one.

The moral is clear: Finish high school. Go to college if you can. And in any case, acquire a skill; learn a craft. Then begin hunting a job.

You will have much better luck.

#### MIDWEST'S DEFENSE SHARE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in Wisconsin we have been deeply concerned as have most Midwestern representatives with the lack of defense contracts which we have been able to secure. Our University of Wisconsin is one of the greatest institutions in America. I do not say that as a Senator, but as objectively as I can. The University of Wisconsin grants more Ph. D.'s than any other university in the world. Our graduate school has an excellent faculty. We also have a very great industrial complex in Wisconsin. Nevertheless, we do not get our share of defense contracts, and, especially, we do not get the research and development contracts we should.

The Milwaukee Journal recently wrote an editorial entitled "Midwest Defense Share on Way Up; Future Is Cloudy."

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### MIDWEST'S DEFENSE SHARE ON WAY UP; FUTURE IS CLOUDY

A report from the Defense Department reveals that the Midwest's share of Government defense contracts isn't as small as earlier dispatches have indicated.

The Department, in an analysis of the geographical distribution of military prime contracts for fiscal year 1960 through fiscal 1962, notes that the East North Central States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan and Wisconsin made the second largest percentage gain—33—during the period. In dollar amount, the increase was from \$2.4 billion to \$3.2 billion. Only the mountain region scored a greater increase. Of the five Midwestern States, the largest relative gains were by Indiana, 105 percent, and Wisconsin, 55 percent.

A previous report showed that East North Central States suffered the largest proportional loss of defense contracts from 1953 to 1960.

Gains in the last 2 years were due largely to increased buying of conventional military hardware for the Army—ranging from rifle ammunition to heavy trucks. The Midwest traditionally has provided the bulk of this equipment.

But the Midwest cannot continue to rely on this type of contract. More and more military contract money is going for complicated missile, aircraft and electronics equipment. Only those areas that make prior investments in the research and development that this new equipment requires stand much chance of winning major contracts.

The Department's largest report provides evidence that areas doing large-scale research and development collect the lion's share of procurement awards, too. The Pacific coast, which holds 46 percent of the military's research and development contracts, received nearly 28 percent of all fiscal 1962 procurement awards. By comparison, the five East North Central States share was 12.6 percent, compared with 11.5 percent in fiscal 1960.

Obviously, continued gains will require increased research and development work in the Midwest.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Would the Senator from Wisconsin advocate a change in the procedures of the Department of Defense under which defense contracts are allocated on the basis of the lowest responsible bidder?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator may recall that I made a real fight on the floor of the Senate to provide such a change, specifically for competitive bidding on research and development contracts. That is not being provided for now. It is exception No. 11 in the procurement code. I feel that it should not be an exception. The people of the Senator's State, California, deserve great credit for the marvelous contribution they have made to defense. We in Wisconsin do not ask for favors. I am concerned about the situation, and we want to make sure that we get what is really due us and that we be given a greater opportunity to contribute to the defense of our country.

Mr. KUCHEL. When the Senator makes statements like "I want to make sure that we get what is due us," there are raised in my mind some questions, because the Senator from Wisconsin is a very able man. The Senator is a patriotic American. I am sure the Senator would agree with me wholeheartedly that the single function of the Secretary of Defense and the Department of Defense is for the security of the American people. If the Secretary of Defense were to determine, in connection with a particular weapons system, that the development of that weapons system ought to go to individuals who are most qualified to develop it, I am sure the Senator would approve of the Secretary's action.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I would indeed. When I said that we should get what is due us, I said that in the context of my full statement including competitive bidding. That is what I mean, we should get what we can earn. The firm that quotes the lowest price and is qualified to do the job should get it. If we in Wisconsin can do the job at a lower price, we should get it. Otherwise we should not get it.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator.

#### MANITOWOC'S FRONT SPACE STORY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the most interesting and, to us in Wisconsin, exciting developments of the space age has been the falling on Wisconsin soil of a part of one of the Russian sputniks. One such fragment fell on the streets in the city of Manitowoc, one of our principal cities in Wisconsin.

The officials of Manitowoc showed remarkable presence of mind and consideration for the national interest when they turned this fragment over to the Federal authorities. It was given to our delegate at the U.N., but it was rejected by the Russians. It is now being examined by some of our top scientists. It will give us some useful information on space and the effects of radiation.

This interesting incident is reported in an article published in the New York Times of yesterday.

I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 7, 1962]

UNITED STATES STUDIES BITS OF SPENT SPUTNIK—PARTS FOUND IN WISCONSIN YIELD RADIATION DATA

(By Walter Sullivan)

More than a score of fragments from the first vehicle launched in the Soviet man-in-space program have been recovered in Wisconsin.

Debris from the disintegrating spaceship seems to be scattered along a 100-mile line traversing the State.

No passenger rode the 2½-ton vehicle when it was launched on May 15, 1960. It was one of two spaceships that went awry while attempting reentry early in the Soviet program. One burned up in the atmosphere. The other, because of improper aim, changed orbit when braking rockets ignited, but did not descend.

It was Sputnik IV that finally plunged into the atmosphere over Wisconsin last September 5. The recovered fragments include portions of a bronze spring that presumably scorched the grass where it landed on a golf course north of Milwaukee.

A number of metal beads rained on the roof of a church in Manitowoc. It stands on the corner where, early on September 5, the headlights of a police car disclosed a piece of metal embedded in the white centerline of the street.

#### A SCIENTIFIC PRIZE

This 20-pound fragment has proved to be both a scientific and political prize.

It is the first specimen known to have been recovered after a prolonged, but precisely known, period of exposure to the many forms of radiation in space close to the earth. This radiation comes from the sun, from the cosmos, and from the Van Allen belts. Its scars have demonstrated, conclusively, that the object fell from the sky.

It also enabled the U.S. representative on the United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space to make a dramatic offer of the specimen to the Russians on September 14. They declined to take it. But Dr. Anatoli A. Blagonravov, the Soviet space expert, was said to have looked closely at the specimen and smiled.

The search in Wisconsin may also turn up material that will disclose secret features of Soviet space technology, such as the type of material used on nose cones to dissipate heat on reentry.

Ironically, identification of the 20-pound specimen as an object from space by five American laboratories has been aided by the gift from Soviet scientists of specimens from two meteorites that fell on Soviet territory in recent years.

It is the similarity of the radioactivity found in those meteorites to that within the Wisconsin fragment that has convinced American scientists in recent days of the latter's origin. The presence of short-lived forms of radiation showed it had just fallen.

The fragment consists of a metal cylinder welded to a metal plate. Both are of steel, but one was cold rolled and the other was hot rolled. Embedded in the metal is a screw whose thread-spacing is of the European and Soviet type. The plate is 1 centimeter thick, likewise suggesting origin in a country that uses the metric system.

Although objects have been recovered from several Wisconsin communities, not all have been definitely identified as having come from space.

One fragment, found in Waupaca, proved to have been put there by a machinist as a hoax.

However, there appears to be no doubt about the many fragments found in Manitowoc. When police spotted the initial piece, at 5:30 a.m., on September 5, they thought it was a patch of cardboard. But on closer examination they found it to be a round piece of metal embedded 1 inch in the asphalt.

#### EMBEDDED IN ASPHALT

When they pried it out it was so hot they had difficulty carrying it to the curb, where they left it. They were unaware of the fireworks that had occurred 40 minutes earlier.

The sequence of events that culminated in those fireworks began several months ago when Spadats, the Space Detection and Tracking System at Ent Air Force Base in Colorado Springs, Colo., predicted that the capsule, Sputnik IV, would fall on or about September 6.

On August 28 the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory in Cambridge, Mass., asked its 750 moonwatch teams and individual observers all over the world to set a special watch. It was to be the start of a concerted

effort to recover an object long exposed to radiation near the earth.

"We have chosen Sputnik IV as our first reentry observing satellite because it is the next large artificial earth satellite expected to reenter the earth's atmosphere after a long exposure to the space environment," the Observatory said.

#### A SCIENTIFIC TROPHY

A fragment would be a major scientific trophy, the notification said. However, in view of the vast ocean and desert areas onto which the pieces might fall, such a recovery on the first attempt seemed more than anyone could hope for.

On the night of September 4-5 the Milwaukee moonwatch team, led by Edward A. Halback, began the watch, as did numerous other teams, organized by the Observatory in Cambridge for such tasks.

One team member, Gale Highsmith, set up a homemade theodolite on a hill. The instrument consisted of 10-cent protractors and a 98-cent telescope mounted on a hoe handle.

He awaited the overhead flight of Sputnik IV, predicted for 4:58 a.m., central daylight time. At 4:49, as described by the Cambridge Observatory's SAO News, "the incredible happened." To the northwest, where the satellite was due, he saw a brilliant object that broke into six pieces as it passed to the north of him. One by one they snuffed out.

Near Green Bay, Wis., a busdriver saw the object. He and his passengers debarked hurriedly and saw a procession of 24 pieces pass directly overhead. Some observers reported hearing thunderous sounds.

#### SAMPLES DISTRIBUTED

When the Manitowoc police heard that Sputnik IV had plunged into the atmosphere overhead, they retrieved their 20-pound fragment and Mr. Highsmith flew with it to the Observatory in Cambridge. Six pounds of its metal was cut off and samples were sent to four other laboratories.

The Observatory dispatched Walter Munn of its meteorite-recovery network to hunt for more fragments. He found many of them.

On the lawn of the First Lutheran Church, near the corner where the original fragment fell, the son of the pastor found a cluster of metallic beads. Mr. Munn climbed onto the roof and found 15 more beads.

Presumably they came off the 20-pound fragment in flight as molten drops that hardened. From the same area Mr. Munn recovered a number of other bead clusters. Several more crusty fragments have been found.

Recovery efforts, described in SAO News and the Observatory's Sky and Telescope, are continuing. The finds are being deposited with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

#### SPEED OF LIGHT

The radioactive substances, or isotopes, found in the initial sample had been produced by cosmic ray bombardment. These rays are atomic particles flying through space almost at the velocity of light, which is about 186,000 miles a second. Their energies often exceed those of the most powerful atom smashers.

The earth is protected from the primary rain of these particles by the shielding effect of its atmosphere and by the deflecting influence of its magnetic field.

The exposure of a meteorite to cosmic rays for millions or billions of years gives it a characteristic collection of radioactive substances. Some are long-lived and others halve their radioactivity in a few days. Capsules recovered from the Discover satellites

in the U.S. military space program have displayed some of this radiation.

One of the Soviet specimens that aided in the analysis was from the Sikhote-Alin meteorite that fell on Siberia in 1947. At the Smithsonian Observatory results obtained from this object and from the Wisconsin sample were compared by Dr. Edward L. Fireman.

He found the roster of radioactive substances in the two bodies to be strikingly similar. Thus the Wisconsin fragment contained sufficient radioactive argon (argon 37) to produce five emissions a minute a kilogram. By comparison the meteorite argon produced 4.5 emissions.

#### EXPERT PUZZLED

At Brookhaven National Laboratory, at Upton, Long Island, Dr. Raymond Davis analyzed another specimen from the Wisconsin fragment and obtained a rate of six emissions a minute. However, he has been puzzled by the absence of tritium, a rare form of hydrogen with a nucleus containing two neutrons in addition to the single proton typical of hydrogen.

In November 1960, when both Sputnik IV and Discoverer 17 were in orbit, there was a fearsome eruption on the sun. After the Discoverer capsule had been recovered it was found that, embedded within it, were atoms of tritium and helium 3, both of them apparently shot directly from the sun into the metal.

One possible explanation for its absence in the Wisconsin specimen, Dr. Davis believes, is that the heat of reentry caused the tritium to escape.

The other Soviet specimen that proved useful was from the Aroos meteorite that fell in 1959. Its radioactive contents analyzed by the University of California at La Jolla, gave Dr. Julian P. Shedlovsky of the Carnegie Institute of Technology, in Pittsburgh, Pa., a basis for comparison.

He found the amounts of the various substances three or four times lower in the Wisconsin sample, possibly because of the shielding effects of the earth, below the vehicle, and the earth's magnetic field above it.

#### EXPLANATION SUGGESTED

However, one substance, manganese 54, was more abundant possibly, Dr. Shedlovsky believes, because Sputnik IV spent part of its early life exposed to the radiation of the Van Allen belt. While particle impacts on the vehicle would be far more numerous in the belt than those of cosmic rays, they would be weaker.

This should lead to a rich store of iron 55, which Dr. Shedlovsky has not yet tallied in his analysis. He and all the other investigators emphasized that their figures are preliminary. Long monitoring will be necessary to obtain precise radiation counts.

The other analysts were Dr. John T. Wason of the Air Force Cambridge Research Laboratories, in Bedford, Mass., and Dr. Ernest C. Anderson of the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory in New Mexico.

Some noted that, while the specimen certainly had fallen from the sky, there was no scientific way to link it to Sputnik IV. However, Dr. Fireman said it may ultimately be possible to tell, by the tally of radioactive materials in a specimen, the nature of its orbit.

For example the manned capsules of the United States have stayed near enough to the Equator to escape the solar protons that sometimes rain on the poles. Vehicles that orbit over the poles are exposed to those showers, as has been seen in the recovered Discoverer capsules. Meteorites, since they come from beyond the shield of the earth's magnetism, have been exposed for millennia to the full intensity of cosmic radiation.



# VOLUNTARY RETIREMENT UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY AT 60 MAKES SENSE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, recently I wrote an article for the October issue of *Eagle*, the publication of the Fraternal Order of Eagles. This order, of course, is well known throughout the country for its devotion to the problems of the aged.

The article which I wrote is entitled "Social Security at 60." It is a discussion of my proposal to reduce the social security age from 62 to 60, so that persons may retire on a moderately reduced benefit at age 60.

I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the *RECORD* at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

## SOCIAL SECURITY AT 60

(By WILLIAM PROXMIRE, U.S. Senator from Wisconsin)

On August 24 of this year, I introduced a bill in the Senate to lower the social security retirement age from 62 to 60. I did so in the belief that although our Nation is engaged in both a space race and an arms race and although it faces a multitude of other complex matters, no problems are more in need of solution than the economic and social difficulties posed by our consistently high rate of unemployment.

It is my hope that the Fraternal Order of Eagles, which has been in the forefront of the fight for social security, will join with me in this further step to improve, both socially and economically, our democratic system.

Our rate of unemployment dramatizes the fact that we are wasting our most precious resource: man and woman power. It means that the most affluent society in the history of man cannot provide millions of its citizenry with the self-respect and living standard that only a job can secure. For more than 10 years I have been visiting factory gates at dawn, in winter, and in summer. Over and over I hear that what these men and women want above all is an opportunity to retire while they still have a few years left in which to enjoy retirement.

Thus, to lower the voluntary retirement age under social security to 60 would help to reduce our unemployment rate in two ways. First it would free thousands of jobs for our younger workers if past action in this area is any guide. For example, the proportion of men 65 and older in the American labor force fell from 53 percent of men of that age in 1930 to 42 percent in 1950, thereby making jobs available to thousands of younger jobseekers.

Much the same thing happened when the age was lowered in 1961, from 65 to 62. In the first month alone over 100,000 people applied for this new program, and it is estimated that over 500,000 ultimately took advantage of this lower age during the first year. Certainly, then, the probability is that further jobs would be freed if the social security age were lowered once again.

This proposal would also affect unemployment by permitting the older worker who is unable to find a job to leave the labor market without going on relief. The impact from this exit of workers would also be quite significant because, as the July 1960 figures showed, 328,000 or well over a third of the unemployed workers aged 45 to 64 had been continuously unemployed for 15 weeks or longer, and in fact, 189,000 of them had been unemployed for more than 26 weeks. The Fraternal Order of Eagles, well versed on this problem, is doing much to help alle-

viate it through its jobs-after-40 program, which seeks to ban discrimination on the part of employers against hiring older workers.

The depth of this problem was well expressed by the White House Conference on the Aging in 1960: "No statistics can do justice to the effect of prolonged unemployment upon the older worker. There is no meaningful measure of discouragement and the sense of personal failure; no way to trace the consequences in terms of the medical care that the individual and his dependents do not get; the curtailed educational programs of his children; the drop in his family's day-by-day living standards; the slow attrition of skills and knowledge; the lowering of status in the community and loss of faith in a social and economic order that indefinitely denies him the opportunity to do useful work. The impact of such consequences upon young, resilient people can be serious, but it can destroy the older worker as a person, changing him, sometimes within months, from a social and economic asset to a liability."

Like the social implications, the reasons for this long-term unemployment among older workers seem reasonably clear and are well worth examination. One of the main reasons older men have difficulty securing employment stems from the policy of job discrimination so many of our Nation's employers pursue.

This policy has been vigorously opposed by the Fraternal Order of Eagles, with the support of citizens' groups, labor, many business firms, and by efforts at both the State and Federal level. In 16 States, through Eagle-sponsored legislation, this type of discrimination has been banned by law. In some areas it has been settled through voluntary cooperation. Unfortunately, however, as Margaret Gordon pointed out in the *Monthly Labor Review*, for November 1959, "Despite widespread efforts of both public and private agencies to break down barriers to the employment of older workers in recent years, there is little evidence that upper limits in hiring are becoming less prevalent in many areas."

But even if job discrimination can be eliminated, our older workers must still face the problem of educational obsolescence. The Department of Labor pointed out both the importance and inevitability of this problem when it stated, "Obsolescence of skills is part of the price of social progress. At any given time the aged population will reflect the patterns of education, of training, and of developed skills which were acquired a generation or more before."

"So far as the economy has progressed and has, therefore, developed or demanded new skills, so far is it likely that the aged will be less well equipped than the young to cope with the new requirements. Although attention should be given to mitigating this obsolescence, it seems at least strongly probable that it could never be overcome."

To be sure, our Nation has always faced this problem, but in the last decade it has reached critical proportions. The tremendous changes we have been experiencing have so drastically changed our job requirements that many of our efforts to combat these innovations seem doomed to failure. It hardly seems feasible, for example, to retrain machine operators or even machinists as physicists or engineers. Yet all too often just such training would be required to fulfill our employment needs.

Moreover, even if the worker should possess the necessary skills to secure work, he may find that in order to actually hold a job, he must leave his friends, his lifelong home, perhaps members of his family and give up a multitude of other things which he may greatly cherish. As the 1960 White House Conference on Aging so eloquently put it, "The hardest hit, when industry dies in a

small town or city, are the older people, those whose ties are by all odds the strongest, who have inherited, bought, or built, and paid for their homes, who have firm standing in the community, and who want to die and be buried there."

All of these problems and the many more which the elderly unemployed worker must face imposes a burden on these people. Our Nation must direct its best efforts toward solving these complex problems, recognizing, however, that even our best efforts are likely to fall far short of eliminating these difficult problems. After expending our best efforts are we, as former Secretary Ribicoff put it, going to say to these people, "go on up to your welfare offices and ask for a handout," or are we going to say, "If you cannot get a job and new industries coming in won't hire you, at least you can have the option of retiring and getting social security benefits."

These are two of the most important questions our country must face and answer. To me the answer is obvious. We must provide our older citizens, who can no longer work, with the option of receiving the benefits under social security for which they have contributed and worked so hard all their lives.

## THE HANDLING OF CONTRACTS UNDER THE STOCKPILE PROGRAM

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, today I call the attention of the Senate to another contract which was negotiated under our stockpile program wherein it does not appear that the interests of the Government were properly protected. I suggest that this may be another contract, the handling of which, the Symington committee will want to examine.

This case involves a contract negotiated on October 4, 1951, by the General Services Administration with the National Lead Co. The Government entered into this as a firm commitment to buy for delivery over a 6½-year period, at a fixed price, certain quantities of nickel, cobalt, and copper, and the National Lead Co. under this contract entered into a similar firm commitment to deliver these quantities of metals, at the prices agreed upon.

After the contract had been signed, however, the market price of nickel, cobalt, and copper increased substantially, and 5 years later the result was, that no deliveries had been made under this contract.

By December 18, 1956, the total market price of the commodities under this contract—upon which no deliveries had been made—had advanced over \$7 million above the contract price. Instead of the Government insisting upon delivery, or upon a payment in lieu, of non-delivery, the Government in 1956 negotiated a new contract—DMP-131—under which they released the National Lead Co. of all its obligations for delivery under the original contract. The Government then, under a new contract, gave the National Lead Co. "put" rights for a comparable amount of nickel, cobalt, and copper at the prevailing higher market price.

Under the second contract these "put" rights meant that the Government was obliged to take the specified quantities of metals at the prices named, but the company was not obligated to furnish.

The market prices named in the second contract were at a level which would cost the Government approximately \$7 million more than the first contract, which was being canceled. There may be some explanation for this multi-million-dollar windfall, but as yet I have not found it.

Subsequently the market price of nickel advanced even further, and since under the second contract, delivery of cobalt and copper was contingent upon the company delivering comparable amounts of nickel, the National Lead Co. was again caught in a position of having to furnish nickel at a price lower than the market price or forfeit its right to deliver cobalt and copper. The price of the cobalt and copper had declined while the price of nickel was higher.

Again, the Government on October 28, 1957, further amended the contract to permit the company to sell its nickel elsewhere upon payment to the Government of the difference between the market and contract prices, and one-half of such amount above the market price as the contractor might receive for its nickel.

This now left the National Lead Co. free to make deliveries of cobalt and copper, both of which in the meantime had declined below the "put" price.

As of January 1, 1960, the contractor's right to tender cobalt had been reduced to 3,660,000 pounds, and its right to tender copper reduced to 3,600,000 pounds. Now the Government decided that it wanted to cancel the contract.

On January 6, 1960, the contract was canceled and the contractor's "put" rights as to the remaining cobalt and copper eliminated. By this time cobalt had declined from the contract price of \$2.60 per pound to \$1.75 per pound, while copper had declined from \$0.36 to \$0.34 per pound.

The total difference between the contract and market prices as to the remaining tonnage of copper and cobalt to which the Government was committed, after certain credits, was approximately \$2,500,000. This amount, \$2,500,000, was paid to the National Lead Co. in "electrolytic nickel" from the DPA inventory priced at market.

Thus we have this situation. In 1951 the Government signed a fixed-price, firm-delivery contract with the National Lead Co. for certain quantities of nickel, cobalt, and copper. The market advanced over \$7 million, but the company made no deliveries. The Government waived its right to any of this profit and canceled this contract in 1956 and then signed a new contract at the prevailing higher market price. This time the Government was obliged to buy a fixed quantity at a fixed price, but the company was not obliged to deliver. In 1960, at which time about half of the quantities under this contract still remained to be delivered and the market having declined \$0.85 per pound on cobalt and \$0.02 per pound on copper, the Government wanted to cancel, and now the National Lead Co. required the Government to pay them \$2½ million cancellation charge.

A more detailed history of this contract is as follows:

*Contract (GS-OOP—(D)—12095) signed Oct. 4, 1951*

	Nickel	Cobalt	Copper
Tonnage (pounds).....	9,261,000	6,930,000	7,087,500
Prices (pound).....	\$0.474	\$1.845	\$0.214
Period of delivery (years).....	6½	6½	6½
Total deliveries as of Dec. 18, 1956.....	0	0	0
Market price Dec. 18, 1956.....	\$0.74	\$2.35	\$0.36050
Increase of market value Dec. 18, 1956, over contract price.....	\$2,463,426	\$3,499,650	\$1,038,318

NOTE.—Total \$7,001,394 equal market increase Dec. 18, 1956.

This was a firm purchase agreement contract, but no deliveries were made. By December 18, 1956, the market price of the undelivered material under this contract had increased \$7,001,394. Notwithstanding the fact that this potential profit belonged to the Government the contract was canceled, and the company was released from its liability to furnish the metals.

This cancellation was not made on the basis that the Government did not need the materials because on the same day that this old contract was canceled, December 18, 1956, a new contract—DMP-131—was signed.

Under this contract the firm delivery requirements of the old contract were changed to "put" rights with a provision tying the right to "put" cobalt and copper to the quantity of nickel tendered.

The "put" rights under the second contract were as follows:

*Contract DMP-131, Dec. 18, 1956*

	Nickel	Cobalt	Copper
Quantity (pounds).....	9,240,000	7,320,000	7,200,000
Prices to be paid.....	\$0.65	\$2.60	\$0.36
Period of delivery (years).....	6	6	6

<sup>1</sup> This price was \$0.25 per pound over the prevailing market price of that same date.

On October 28, 1957, the price of nickel was \$0.74 per pound, or 9 cents per pound higher than the "put" price in the contract, so the Government again amended this contract to release the company of its requirement that the amount of cobalt and copper tendered was to be tied to the amount of nickel delivered. Accordingly—on October 28, 1957—the second contract was further changed to permit the contractor to sell its nickel elsewhere upon payment to the Government of the difference between the market and contract prices, and one-half of such amount above the market price as the contractor might receive for its nickel but still allowing the company to deliver cobalt and copper.

The company then delivered the following amounts of cobalt and copper to the Government under the "put" rights of the second contract:

	Cobalt	Copper
Amount delivered (pounds).....	2,885,789	2,840,000

As of January 1, 1960, the contractor's right to tender cobalt had been reduced

to 3,660,000 pounds and its right to tender copper had been reduced to 3,600,000 pounds—nickel having been eliminated from the contract in 1957 as indicated above.

By this time the price of cobalt had declined from the contract "put" price of \$2.60 per pound to \$1.75 per pound, representing a drop of 85 cents per pound, and copper declined from 36 cents to 34 cents per pound, or a decline of 2 cents per pound.

Thus as of January 6, 1960, the Government faced a potential loss of \$3,183,000 on the undelivered portion of the contract, but now the Government decided that it did not need these metals and advised the company that it wanted to cancel the contract.

On January 6, 1960, the contract was canceled as to the contractor's "put" rights on the remaining cobalt and copper. Under the terms of this cancellation \$2,500,000 was paid to the National Lead Co. as a cancellation charge. This payment was made in electrolytic nickel from the DPA inventory priced at market.

An argument was made that this \$2½ million payment was in part an offset for a \$3 million investment which the company had made in a plant which as a part of this cancellation agreement they were turning back to the Government. But an examination of this claim not only refutes the argument but raises more questions. For instance, this was the plant arrangement:

The National Lead Co. did convey to the Government title to certain facilities but the Government promptly leased these back to the National Lead Co. for 6 years for only a token payment.

Under the original contract the Government had advanced \$7,500,000 toward the construction of the refinery. No repayment had been made either on the principal or on the interest of this \$7,500,000 advance. The National Lead Co. claims that it had spent around \$3 million of its own funds to complete this refinery which was being returned to the Government. But as the company turned this refinery over to the Government at the same time it obtained a lease for a period of 6 years at a rental of \$600,000 per year; however, rent for the first 5 years was waived in recognition of National Lead Co.'s investment of \$3 million in the Fredericktown, Mo., facilities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter dated September 6, 1962, together with a tabulation of contract information, and a letter dated September 19, 1962, both letters signed by Mr. Bernard L. Boutin, Director of General Services Administration.

There being no objection, the letters and table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,  
Washington, D.C. September 6, 1962.

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: With further reference to your letter of August 21, we are enclosing information concerning contracts with the National Lead Co.



All of the contracts listed were purchase contracts, except for No. 12095, which was an expansion type contract. The latter contract was the only one on which a cancellation was involved. The cancellation occurred simultaneously with the execution of

a new contract, No. DMP-131, on December 18, 1956.

In accordance with your request for market price information, we have indicated on the attachment, appropriate prices prevailing on December 18, 1956, when No. 12095 was succeeded by No. 131; on October 28, 1957, when

No. 131 was amended to eliminate the nickel "put"; and on January 6, 1960, when copper and cobalt were eliminated from the contract.

Sincerely yours,

BERNARD L. BOUTIN,  
Administrator.

Contract No.	Date	Commodity	Tonnage (short tons)	Price	Period of delivery	Delivered
SCM-TS-13008....	Feb. 15, 1949	Lead, antimonial.....	3,800	Market month prior to shipment.	February, March, April, and May, 1949.	
		Lead, common, contractor's option to furnish corroding or chemical.	7,600	do.....	do.....	
SCM-TS-14340....	May 2, 1949	Lead, corroding.....	200	\$0.151 per pound.....	Shipment May 15, 1949.....	
GS-OOP-3759 (SCM).	Oct. 30, 1952	do.....	1,200	Market specified month of shipment.	800 short tons November 1952..... 400 short tons December 1952.....	2,399,894 pounds.

**GS-OOP(D)-12095 (succeeded by contract DMP-131) Oct. 4, 1951**

	Nickel	Cobalt	Copper
Tonnage (pounds).....	9,261,000	6,930,000	7,087,500
Price per pound.....	\$0.474	\$1.845	\$0.214
Period of delivery (years).....	6½	6½	6½
Total deliveries (pounds).....	0	2,885,789	2,840,000
Contract in effect amended on Dec. 18, 1956; among other things the prices to be paid were set at.....	\$0.65	\$2.60	\$0.36
Undelivered portion at time of increase in price.....	(?)	(?)	(?)

<sup>1</sup> Under the amendment (actually a new contract) the contractor conveyed to the Government the title to the contract facilities, which the Government in turn leased back to National Lead Co. for 6 years. The firm delivery requirements as to metals produced were changed to "put" rights with an appropriate provision tying the right to put cobalt and copper to the quantity of nickel tendered.

On Oct. 28, 1957, the contract was further amended to permit the contractor to sell its nickel elsewhere upon payment to the Government of the difference between the market and contract prices, and ½ of such amount above the market price as the contractor might receive for its nickel.

On Jan. 6, 1960, the contract was further amended to cancel the contractor's "put" rights as to the remaining cobalt and copper, nickel having been eliminated in 1957. The difference between the contract and market prices as to the remaining tonnage to which the Government was exposed, after giving effect to counter credits growing out of the contractor's lease obligation, \$2,500,000 was paid to the contractor in electrolytic nickel from the DPA inventory priced at market. The long-term lease was canceled and a firm lease for 9 months with 30-day extension privileges was signed. Subsequently, in April 1961, the lease was finally terminated and the facility was vacated by the contractor.

It should be stated that the original contract was designed to create capacity, nonexistent in the United States, to treat the intermediate residues from the contractor's own lead and zinc operation, to increase the supply of nickel, cobalt, and copper.

The original contract entailed the advance by the Government of \$5,000,000, later increased by amendment to \$7,500,000 to the contractor for the construction of the refinery, later as shown above, turned over to the Government after the contractor had expended some \$3,000,000 of its own funds to complete.

**Market prices**

	Nickel	Cobalt	Copper
Dec. 18, 1956.....	\$0.74	\$2.35	\$0.36050
Oct. 28, 1957.....	.74		
Jan. 6, 1960.....		1.75	.34

\* Delivered.

<sup>2</sup> No prior delivery.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,  
Washington, D.C., September 19, 1962.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is to confirm the information furnished you by a member of our Defense Materials Service staff concerning contracts GS-OOP(D)-12095 and DMP-131 with National Lead Co., involving facilities at Fredericktown, Mo., in response

to questions you raised upon receipt of our letter of September 6.

Contract DMP-131 provided "put" rights to National Lead Co. for 9,240,000 pounds of nickel, 7,320,000 pounds of cobalt, and 7,200,000 pounds of copper, over a period of 6 years from the effective date, which was December 1, 1956.

As of January 1, 1960, the contractor's right to tender cobalt had been reduced to 3,660,000 pounds and to tender copper had been reduced to 3,600,000 pounds. As you know, nickel had been eliminated from the contract.

The term of the lease originally provided under contract DMP-131 was 6 years with a rental of \$600,000 per year. However, rent for the first 5 years was waived in recognition of National Lead Co.'s investment of more than \$3 million in the Fredericktown facilities. This lease continued for 3 years and 1 month, through December 31, 1959, when by the amendment of January 6, 1960, it was converted to a firm lease for 9 months, with the right of the lessee to continue thereafter on a month-to-month basis. The contractor did continue in possession through April 30, 1961. The rental was at the rate of \$190,000 per annum or 6½ percent of gross sales, whichever is greater.

There were no repayments on the \$7,500,000 of advances made to construct the facilities.

The market price of nickel on January 6, 1960, was 74 cents per pound.

The first contract, GS-OOP(D)-12095, was a firm purchase agreement, while the second contract, DMP-131, was of the floor price type with "put" rights in National Lead. No deliveries were made under the first contract, as the facilities were just reaching the production stage when contract DMP-131 was executed. Thus, the deliveries shown in the tabulation accompanying our letter of September 6 were made under contract DMP-131.

Sincerely yours,

BERNARD L. BOUTIN,  
Administrator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIER in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

**EXECUTIVE SESSION**

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

**TREASURER OF THE UNITED STATES**

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Mrs. KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN, of Pennsylvania, to be Treasurer of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

**COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS**

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John G. Green, of Wisconsin, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 36, with headquarters at Duluth, Minn.-Superior, Wis.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask that the nomination go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the nomination will be passed over.

**APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE IN CUSTOMS COLLECTION DISTRICT NO. 10**

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Michael Stramiello, Jr., of New York, to be appraiser of merchandise in customs collection district No. 10, with headquarters at New York, N.Y.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In his capacity as a Senator from Wisconsin, the Chair suggests the absence of a quorum. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I regret that I had not been informed that objection had been raised to all the nominations on the Executive Calendar. I knew of the objection to the consideration of one nomination; but the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin has just informed the acting majority leader that he has objection to the con-

sideration of all three nominations unless all three may be taken up and confirmed. On that basis, I move that the action by which the nomination of Mrs. KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN, Pennsylvania, to be Treasurer of the United States was confirmed be vacated.

The motion was agreed to.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

#### FOREIGN AID

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I desire to comment with respect to the foreign aid appropriation bill conference report which was approved today. I have noted with considerable interest that the press has called our attention to the fact that the item of foreign aid was sharply reduced from the administration's original request. Certain items in the foreign aid appropriation bill were too sharply reduced.

I recognized the problem in the conference committee. I have served on many conferences. I know that foreign aid is essentially a process of compromise. But I remind the Senate that the cuts that were made in the Development Loan Fund, that is, in the loan section of the bill, were cuts which I think were too deep.

I also feel that the process of negotiation in conference, by which these substantial cuts were agreed to, will in the months ahead cause the administration of the AID program some difficulty.

This morning the New York Times published an editorial entitled "Future of Foreign Aid." It may very well be that the editorial has already been referred to. In a sense, I believe it forewarns both Congress and the administration of the future of foreign aid.

First, it seems to me, there has been a growing lack of understanding on the part of Congress concerning what the foreign aid program has done, is doing, and can do. This results in less support for the program.

It was my privilege to be in charge of the foreign aid appropriation bill during the Senate's consideration of it. I well recognize the closeness of many votes, the sharp opposition having been registered not against the program as such, but against the amount of the program. I want the AID administration and the Department of State to have the overall responsibility for the AID program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the New York Times editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 8, 1962]

#### FUTURE OF FOREIGN AID

The Kennedy administration is reported to be getting some satisfaction out of the conference version of the foreign aid bill, passed by the House, on the philosophic

ground that the final bill might have been worse. This is no doubt true, but certainly no enthusiasm can be expected from the supporters of foreign aid.

The final compromise appropriation of \$3,928,900,000 reflects a cut of about 20 percent below the President's original request. Almost \$300 million of this shortfall is concentrated in the appropriation for long-term development loans. The compromise does give the President discretionary authority with regard to economic aid for Poland and Yugoslavia and for non-Communist countries whose ships move goods to Cuba.

With the sobering lesson of this long and bitter foreign aid battle behind it, the administration can have no illusions about the task it will face again next year in this field. The rising tide of congressional impatience with foreign aid could really result in disaster in the future if prompt action is not taken soon to find the bases of this discontent and to act against them. In seeking to change the climate of congressional opinion the administration will need very much the help of recipient countries which should be aware of their own self-interest in presenting vivid proof soon of important economic and political gains made with our help.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the editorial reads, in part, as follows:

The final compromise appropriation of \$3,928,900,000 reflects a cut of about 20 percent below the President's original request. Almost \$300 million of this shortfall is concentrated in the appropriation for long-term development loans. The compromise does give the President discretionary authority with regard to economic aid for Poland and Yugoslavia and for non-Communist countries whose ships move goods to Cuba.

With the sobering lesson of this long and bitter foreign aid battle behind it, the administration can have no illusions about the task it will face again next year in this field. The rising tide of congressional impatience with foreign aid could really result in disaster in the future if prompt action is not taken soon to find the bases of this discontent and to act against them.

I have said a number of times that if the AID administration is really to be able to interpret what the foreign aid program does for the people at home and for people in other parts of the world, we must learn to interpret the program as being something else besides the dollar sign.

When people hear of an appropriation of \$3,900 million or \$4 billion, they justifiably take a long look at it, because it represents a great sum of money. For some peculiar reason, there is a lack of communication between the aid program and the American people and, in fact, people in other parts of the world.

I wonder why we do not talk about what the aid program does, for example, in connection with the projects which are underway and the jobs which are supplied, both at home and abroad. I wonder how many Senators and Members of the House of Representatives have ever tried to evaluate what it would mean to our economy if the aid program were dropped, in view of the fact that 78 to 80 cents out of every dollar for the aid program is spent in the United States, for goods and services from the United States. What does this program mean in district after district and in State after State? Every time we consider a public works bill, someone reminds the Congress, "This will mean

great things for my district. It will mean new jobs, new employment, new business."

Yet, Mr. President, every year the foreign aid program does more for the American economy than do all the public works programs put together.

What does the aid program do overseas? It builds homes. It helps establish sound governments. It maintains friends in power. It permits countries to have programs of public help. It provides for education for millions of children. It builds schools, railroads, roads, harbors, public facilities. It provides for processing and manufacturing, and for some degree of modernization in agriculture. These are just a few of the things the aid program does.

So I suggest to the AID administration that it should begin to interpret this program in some way other than by means of an accountant's sheet or a budget document, or as if the only thing involved were a bank statement. After all, there is scarcely anything much more old, barren, and sterile than a set of figures on a ledger sheet. This program needs some good, red blood, so to speak, and some vitality. It needs interpretation on the basis of the human factors and the industrial, economic, and social developments involved. Perhaps one of these days someone will interpret the foreign aid program on the basis of what it does for people, for children, for agriculture, for land, for water, for all the natural resources.

Mr. President, the American people are doers and builders. They understand programs which result in construction and worthwhile developments. But when they are constantly told of nothing except a balance sheet or expended funds, unexpended funds, obligated funds, and unobligated funds, that is a kind of political kangaroo that few persons understand.

Instead, why do not those in charge of our AID program speak of it in terms of the number of houses that have been built, the number that are in process of construction, and the additional number on the drawing boards, instead of all the "baloney" about obligated funds, unobligated funds, expended funds, and unexpended funds. Only a few of our people are cost accountants. The American people are interested in doing things, in creating things. The trouble with the administration of our foreign aid program is that those in charge attempt to explain it in bookkeepers' terms and accountants' and bankers' terms. Instead it needs to be presented in terms of engineering projects, scientific projects, teaching projects, doctors' projects, and a host of other projects that have definite meaning to people. Of course, accounting is needed, and so are balance sheets. It is true that we need to know how much money we have, how much money we need, how much more will be needed a year from now, and so forth.

But when General Motors gets ready to sell its 1963 automobiles, it does not publish in the Saturday Evening Post its ledger statement, together with a fantastic accounting sheet punched full of holes—something that very few of our



people can understand. Similarly, when an insurance company is engaging in a sales program, it does not publish its cost and expenditure statements. Instead, it uses advertisements that have definite meaning to the mass of the people—for example, an advertisement showing a mother and her child. The child is asking, "Where is daddy?" Or it publishes an advertisement with a picture of a grandfather and a grandmother who are content and comfortable because of the payments they are receiving from an annuity. Undoubtedly a definite sum of money is involved; but the advertisements concentrate on the symbols of the happy grandfather and grandmother, or the happy family with a home and a car—all made possible because of insurance. The insurance companies do not base their advertisements on statistical statements of obligated funds, unobligated funds, expenditures, balances, and all that gibberish.

The trouble with the foreign aid program is that in explaining it to the public, those in charge of it concentrate on the dollar amounts involved, instead of explaining the program in terms of the security of the United States, the security of other nations, the prosperity and welfare of our country, and the prosperity and welfare of other countries. Certainly our whole country would be better off if those who discuss our foreign aid program were to begin to talk of what is obtained for the dollars that are spent, instead of just referring to the dollar amounts involved.

Similarly, so far as the funds spent for military purposes are concerned, few people would know what our military expenditures stand for if we did not have the flyovers with the Blue Angels and the other spectaculars. Not enough of our administrators have discussed these programs in terms of the dreams for the future and what can be the promise for man.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator from Minnesota has been stating what these programs mean in terms of employment and employees in the United States, as a result of the foreign aid extended by us to other countries. He has stated that from 78 to 80 percent of these funds is actually spent in the United States.

However, let me point out that the other 20 to 22 percent is not spent in other highly industrialized countries. In short, the only money that is spent in other countries is spent in lesser developed countries. So such expenditures do not react against us, in connection with our balance-of-payments problem.

The Senator from Minnesota has referred to what this program means in terms of employment. I should like to mention an example in that connection; after all, if we speak only in general terms, people may not be aware of the specifics.

In June, I was informed that a plant in the Birmingham area was to be closed. It is a subsidiary of United States Steel. One of the plants there is a rail-rolling plant. We learned that that plant was

about to be closed, and that more than 1,200 people would lose their jobs.

At about that time the United States made a loan to Pakistan—or had just agreed to make such a loan—for the rehabilitation of the railroads in Pakistan. Involved in that was the purchase of steel rails.

I took up with Mr. Hamilton and his associates in the aid program the problem involved in the prospective closing of the plant in the Birmingham area. I did so in an effort to ascertain whether a contract for the plant could be obtained.

I found that such a contract was obtainable, under a competitive bidding arrangement; and a \$9 million contract was awarded. As a result, that plant—instead of closing on July 1, the date which had definitely been set as the closing date—continued to operate, and is operating today, and 1,200 people remain employed—whereas in the absence of that contract, they would not have employment in that community. That is but one of many examples of gains in employment as a result of this program, entirely aside from the consideration of the dollar benefits to that community; and throughout the country there are many, many other cases of that sort, which so many persons are prone to overlook.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Indeed so; and I thank the Senator from Alabama. No man is more intimately acquainted with the operation of the foreign aid program than is the distinguished Senator from Alabama or the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. Others are acquainted with the foreign aid program, but these two Senators have taken the lead in managing the authorizations for what I would like to call mutual security. During the process we get reams of testimony, thousands upon thousands of pages, many thousands of words of testimony, from some of the most able officials we have in Government.

I want to conclude my remarks on the foreign aid problem by saying I know there have been mistakes. As the present Presiding Officer, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER], who spoke ably and brilliantly on this subject said, we do need tightening up. We cannot condone waste. We ought to exercise every possible rule of discipline and self-discipline to eliminate waste.

The AID administration has now appointed a sort of comptroller general, or an officer to watch over all of the expenditures, Mr. Mansfield, who used to be with the Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery of the Committee on Government Operations. I believe this particular office of postaudit will be very helpful.

I think, however, that we ought to keep in mind that it is the mistake, it is the error in judgment, it is the horrible example every so often that gets in the news. For example, if we have a project which goes wrong in South America—and we have had some—there is always a subcommittee of Congress that investigates, and that project makes the news. That is the headline story. But I want to say some of the good news needs to be recited as well, the good

news, for example, that, because of our foreign aid and food for peace program, 42 million children in Latin America, north Africa, and the Middle East, are getting school lunches. And they know where it is coming from, because in every schoolroom in every one of those countries there is a sign, literally as big as this wall, that says, "This food is a gift from the people of the United States to the children of this country," whatever the country may be.

I have seen it. I have come home to tell the story, but I cannot get much news coverage out of it. But if I had come home and said, "Do you know what they are doing with that food? They are stealing it or blackmarketing it," they would say, "There is news, Senator HUMPHREY." But was it news to learn that in thousands of classrooms all over the world, which we helped build, where there are teachers we helped educate and train, there was a lunch program that we helped provide? Oh, no, that was not news. That is like loving your mother—it is not news.

There is something wrong—we are fed on news of evil, on bad news, rather than good news. The foreign aid program has much good in it. Malaria is being eradicated throughout the world. Thousands of young Americans were victims of malaria during World War II. Throughout Africa tropical diseases are being conquered as a result of the foreign aid program, the medical program of the foreign aid program, and through cooperation with the World Health Organization.

Thousands and thousands of young persons are being trained as technicians, through the foreign aid program, to help make a better country and a better world. Through foreign aid we are teaching people to help themselves build their own homes and put in some sanitation facilities. We are building farm-to-market roads. One of the real problems in Latin America is a lack of roads from producing areas in the back country to the cities. Without communication and transportation, there is no market. We are helping that situation through our foreign aid program. We have irrigated millions of acres of land through Africa, north Africa, and the Middle East.

We have brought about some good with foreign aid, and I think the program deserves a pat on the back, instead of only a kick in the pants. I think it needs a better understanding on the part of the people. That does not mean whenever there is a mistake we ought not to do something about it. In fact, I have suggested that whenever mismanagement is discovered, Members of Congress and of the foreign aid administration should be dispatched to investigate and to bring back a report. If someone is responsible, fire him; do not give him some kind of a nice chit-chat. Get somebody new. Apply some high standards and discipline. But when someone does a good job, honor him; give him some honor.

One of the troubles with the foreign aid program is that every person who works for it is under a cloud of suspicion. We have had so much criticism of the foreign aid program that everyone who works for it feels he has to constantly

justify his very existence. I do not know that that is necessary. For example, I know Mr. Hamilton is doing a good job. I am not in a position to know whether the job is as good as the Government wants it to be, but he is conscientious. I know he is able. I know he is honest. I know he wants to get the most out of every dollar we spend. I think he deserves a chance. He cannot have a chance if he lives in a political environment in which every time he walks down the street someone pops out from behind a political tree and takes a whack at him. He deserves a chance, and this program deserves support. That is why this Senator has worked for it.

I also know it is not always so popular back home to be for foreign aid, but the purpose of men in public life is not to engage in popularity contests. The place to do that is in Hollywood. I think what we should engage in is a contest of dedication to the public interest. I happen to believe that the foreign aid program is necessary to our national security. I think it is as vital as our atomic energy program, our nuclear program, and our defense program. I think if we weaken it or chip away at it and discredit it, we will end up doing harm to our own security.

I do not think every dollar the administration asks for should be granted willy-nilly. Let me put that idea at rest at once. I am a member of the Foreign Relations Committee. The committee conscientiously goes over every request made under this program. We look into it meticulously. I sit on the Appropriations Committee. I know that committee takes a good, hard look.

I read in the press that a Member of the other body seems to have undue influence about the final figure of appropriations for foreign aid. I hope that is fiction, and not fact. I think it is. I do not believe any deals were made. I know it makes a nice story. There was a rumor running about, but I am convinced this program needs to be judged on its merits.

One final word and I want to conclude my remarks by calling to the attention of the Senate the editorial I read from the New York Times, entitled "Financial Veto." It relates to the continued problem of United Nations finances. I am deeply concerned about what is happening in the U.N., with many new nations becoming members. The new figure is 108 member nations.

According to the most recent report, the United Nations, despite the bond issue, finds itself in serious financial difficulties. As of August 31, the United Nations owed \$139.7 million against net cash resources of \$33.3 million. Certain nations have not paid their assessments. Certain nations have not paid their obligations. These nations are found not alone in the Soviet bloc. France, Belgium, South Africa, and the Arab countries are in arrears or have not paid up their obligations.

Mr. Frank Aiken, the Irish Minister for External Affairs, a position equivalent to that of our Secretary of State, calls this a financial veto. As the Soviet Union has used the veto more than 100

times in the Security Council literally to incapacitate the Security Council, to deny the Security Council the authority it is supposed to have under the charter, now certain nations by their refusal to pay their obligations are exercising a financial veto, a new kind of veto, over the U.N. operations.

I am hopeful that in this session of the United Nations—and I have spoken of this before—our country will press in the General Assembly and with the appropriate committees for a resolution of these financial difficulties. We ought to insist upon an outlined program for financing the U.N. I have mentioned this in the Senate on several occasions, during the discussion of the U.N. bond issue, and within the past month.

During the summer I had one of the interns who was assigned to me from one of our universities do some research work in the field of the financing of U.N. operations. I am convinced that the United Nations needs a financial officer. Exactly as we have a Secretary of the Treasury, the United Nations needs a financial secretary. I think our own Government ought to take the lead in seeing to it that there is financial responsibility in the United Nations. Otherwise the U.N. can be paralyzed by financial weakness or can die of economic anemia. There may be the shell of the U.N. with all the trappings of the U.N.—the buildings, the delegates' lounge, the assembly hall, the Security Council Chamber, the trustee chamber, and so on—but there will be no vitality.

The United Nations is important to the world in which we live. It is important to our foreign policy. If the United Nations were to collapse, the whole structure of American foreign policy would have to be revised. The only nation which would not have to revise its foreign policy upon the collapse of the United Nations would be the Soviet Union. When will this story be driven home to the American people? The Soviet Union wants the United Nations to be weak. It does not insist that the U.N. buildings be torn down. It does not insist that the charter be scrapped. It insists only that whatever happens in the U.N. be ineffective. It insists only that the U.N. be powerless. And it is doing everything it can to make the U.N. powerless.

I believe that the Government of the United States, which has predicated its foreign policy since 1945 upon membership of the United Nations, has as much at stake in the United Nations and in its strength, its resiliency, its effectiveness, and its solvency as it has in any other single institution in our national or international life.

I believe that when the storm warnings are up we should do everything we can to prepare for the days ahead. There will be some difficult and dark hours. I am hopeful that despite the crisis in Berlin, the problems with respect to Cuba, and the host of other problems which plague us, we will not forget the United Nations itself, which should be high on the agenda of American priorities.

Think how fortunate it is, Mr. President, that the United Nations headquar-

ters is in our own country now. The Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk, has been there day after day consulting with the foreign ministers and leaders of all the 108 countries. It provides a very convenient forum for our statesmen and our leaders.

Some of the most encouraging developments of recent days are to be found in the conferences which Secretary Rusk has been conducting. I think he has been doing an admirable job. I think his record of performance should warm the heart of every American and give us new confidence. His recent meetings with the foreign ministers of the Latin-American countries was a milestone of progress between our country and our neighbors to the south, particularly as it relates to the difficult problem concerning Cuba. Also, Secretary Rusk has been pursuing relentlessly but quietly and with statesmanlike conduct our relationships with other countries, trying to find some way to resolve some of the differences which now exist between ourselves and others. In the meantime, he is building friends and allies.

Make no mistake about it, before January 1, 1963, this country will be faced with some tough decisions. The President of the United States and the Congress will be faced with the issue of the survival of this Nation. Basic principles of foreign policy will be challenged in the corridors leading to Berlin, challenged in the Caribbean, and challenged in southeast Asia.

We are in for a hard winter. We shall find, unless we are prepared to meet those challenges—and they will come from many directions—that much of what we have built and much of what we have worked for will start to fall apart.

This is why I believe Secretary Rusk's conferences are so vital. I commend him for his foresight. I commend the President for charging the Secretary with this responsibility and for trying to look to the future to see what can be done and how we can build a stronger body of free nations to stand up against the constant probing and pressuring by the Soviet Union.

I do not think we should for a moment dismiss the rumors or even the direct talk which comes to us about Berlin. It has been said in high places—and it should be spread on the public record—that between now and January, possibly in November or December, basic decisions will be made in respect to Berlin, and we will be challenged there. Our presence will be challenged there. This will be a test of American strength, of NATO, of our resolve, of our policy, of our statesmanship, and of our courage.

I commend the American press for constantly reminding us of this without trying to be jingoistic or inflammatory. Some excellent articles are appearing every day about the problem. Over the past weekend a number of them were published.

Mr. Khrushchev is preparing the way for the showdown decision upon Berlin. He is trying to force our hand in Cuba. He continues, through his international



Communist apparatus, to nibble at southeast Asia.

This is why, Mr. President, I feel that every bold decision we make—on foreign aid, on military defense items, on our economy, on the United Nations, on the Alliance for Progress—is vital, and every one has to be weighed very carefully. This is why I sincerely believe we can be penny wise and pound foolish. We can look like we are doing well today, only to build for ourselves troubles tomorrow if we try to skimp, if we try to cut corners, when we ought to be preparing for the most crucial hours of our Republic.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "Financial Veto" be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### FINANCIAL VETO

As everyone knows, the permanent members of the United Nations Security Council can block any decision by interposing a veto, and the Soviet representatives have frequently invoked this right.

But another type of veto, undefined in the statutes of the United Nations, is being used effectively by the Soviet bloc, by France, Belgium, South Africa, and the Arab countries. This is what Frank Aiken, Irish Minister for External Affairs, calls the financial veto, the refusal to contribute to funds that the United Nations urgently needs for its peace-keeping operations in the Congo and in the Middle East.

The annual cost of keeping the peace in the Congo and the Middle East is \$140 million. Fifty-one nations have not contributed a penny to the Congo operations. Twelve are in arrears. Twenty-six have not paid anything to the Middle East fund, and 24 are in arrears. This record is deplorable and dangerous.

Despite the \$200 million bond issue, and the decision of Congress authorizing the administration to match bond purchases by other countries up to a maximum of \$100 million, the United Nations is in dire financial straits. As of August 21 the United Nations owed \$139,700,000 against net cash resources of \$33,300,000. The prospects for the next few months are hardly any brighter, as debts are expected to increase almost as rapidly as new funds come in.

With the most recent admissions there are today 108 member nations. The security of all, particularly of the new and small members, is involved in the continuation of the United Nations. Collapse of the world organization due to the "financial veto" is inadmissible; yet it looms as a dire—and real—possibility.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield the floor. [Applause.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The galleries will be in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to have a staff member try to reach the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], who I believe is in the cloakroom, and to whom I have agreed to yield. He has a very sad announcement to make. While waiting for the Senator from California, I shall address the Senate on another subject.

#### CHAPLAIN FREDERICK BROWN HARRIS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, 2 years ago the Chaplain of the Senate, Chaplain Harris, made an official trip to Hawaii on behalf of the Senate. At the time I not

only was familiar with that trip, but also I was one who recommended that the Chaplain should make the trip to Hawaii. For some unexplained reason, that trip has been subjected to very unfair and unjust criticism of the Chaplain, giving the impression that the Chaplain took some junket. Some time ago a story appeared in the Christian Century criticizing the Chaplain's trip.

In a letter to the editor under date of September 26, 1962, the Chaplain replied to that article. I ask unanimous consent that the article and the Chaplain's letter in the Christian Century replying to the unfair and unjust attack upon him for the official Senate trip that he made to Hawaii some 2 years ago be published at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Meanwhile, a Chicago Daily News reporter sifting through the Secretary of the Senate's report for fiscal 1961 came up with evidence that the occupants of the other Capitol wing are also concerned for the aid and comfort of religion (perhaps we should have put that last word in quotes). He discovered that in October 1960 the Senate decided to make its Chaplain, Frederick Brown Harris, an "ex officio" member of the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency. It just happened that the Chaplain and his wife were off for a 3-week trip to Hawaii, and that way the travel expenses could be paid out of committee funds. The reporter delved further. Though the subcommittee's staff director said the whole thing was news to him, Mr. Harris explained that on his return he submitted a report on "Problems Growing Out of the Mingling of the Races," and the work of "a fine group of citizens who are exposing attempts at Communist infiltration there." Juvenile Communists, we presume. At any rate, the Chaplain couldn't recall off-hand the name of the group exposing their activity. Oh well, at least the Senate sessions continue to be opened with prayer.

And apparently it is appreciated. Declaring it is most unfortunate that each day's issue of the Senate's official Journal does not include "for the benefit of posterity" the Chaplain's prayer delivered on that day, Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, proposed that the "beautiful, moving and inspiring prayer" delivered July 25, by Chaplain Frederick Brown Harris be inserted as an amendment to the day's official record. He made his proposal in a speech holding that the Senate prayer does not violate the first amendment.

#### BUT THE FACT IS

SIR: \* \* \* My attention has been called by several preachers shocked by your editorial (August 22) referring to my mission to Hawaii almost 2 years ago. You have seen fit to give wings to an utterly false conception of my weeks in Honolulu which was by no means a junket but an officially authorized mission. Some ambitious reporter—evidently a man with a "muck-rake"—who apparently was not looking for facts but for scandal, included me in a series of articles on people in the Government allegedly using taxpayers' money for personal purposes.

After having been fairly well known for many years as a minister of Methodist churches in New York and Washington, and as Chaplain of the U.S. Senate for 18 years, you printed this smear without any attempt to check up with me as to the truth or untruth of what this reporter has spread before the country as he makes his living picking up salacious bits from political gutters. The editorial \* \* \* is in every way unworthy

of the once-high journalistic standard of [your] publication. Apart from its giving credence to something entirely false it is written in a "smart aleck" sarcastic style unbecoming of any church publication. \* \* \*

My going to Hawaii was in no way a vacation. It was a mission set up by the Senate. I had been in Hawaii twice, 6 years ago, when President Eisenhower sent me as special ambassador to Korea. With Mrs. Harris I had already seen its beauties and had become somewhat acquainted with its problems. \* \* \* Members of the Cabinet and high military leaders in the Pentagon felt that Syngman Rhee, as a political exile in Hawaii, desperately needed my companionship and counsel. I had been his pastor and close friend for many years and he was pleading with me to come to his side. Then a number of the Senate leaders, including those from Hawaii, felt that I might render a service of good will in speaking to various groups regarding the meanings of Americanism and the menace of communism, as I had attempted to do in various parts of America. My going was to be a sort of salute to the new State.

The idea of the mission grew until my schedule in Hawaii was as strenuous as any I have ever undertaken. For the objectives of the proposed trip I was notified officially that for the period of the visit I had been made a member of the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency. That was done because that designation would cover human relationships of all kinds and also provide for my bare traveling expenses. On arrival in the new State our commanding general, T. D. White, asked for a conference at his headquarters. He cooperated with my mission in every way as did the splendid Senators from Hawaii. Senator OREN LONG gave me the use of his office and his secretary for the purposes of the mission.

In the weeks of my stay I spoke almost every day, sometimes twice a day, to an aggregate of several thousand including our Armed Forces at Schofield Barracks and to students in educational institutions, including 1,500 in 2 addresses in 1 day. I also addressed numbers of Hawaiian citizens at various clubs and groups—Rotary, Kiwanis, etc. I also brought messages to the Army chaplains and their wives regarding their vital work, and to representatives of the council of churches. All this in addition to preaching engagements. The press of Hawaii gave conspicuous space to my doings and statements. I spent many hours with Syngman Rhee and his wonderful wife and for what I endeavored to do in strengthening that truly great man, in that cruel crisis in his life, I received expressions of appreciation from our highest Washington officials.

One of the most influential organizations in Hawaii, of which your editorial spoke disparagingly, is headed by an outstanding physician. This alert group of real Americans keeps a constant vigil with regard to the attempts of communism to infiltrate the islands. With them I spent many hours and learned much. (Your) snide reference to "juvenile Communists" is an indication of how little you know with regard to the Red peril. \* \* \*

During my stay in Hawaii I talked with the Governor at the statehouse. At the request of Honolulu officials I gave a day to be taken, in an official car, for glimpses of their operations in combating juvenile delinquency—and adult delinquency also. Piloted by church leaders, I made a number of visits to churches of various denominations in the city and its environs, which are ministering to different races and engaged in programs to decrease juvenile delinquency. I even attended a church conference where a known Communist had the affrontery to tell the assembled delegates what the church (in which he does not believe) ought to do to serve the present age. \* \* \*

All of Mrs. Harris' expenses were paid by us, including the hotel costs. All I received was traveling expenses for myself. If any mission of such proportions ever cost the Government less, I would like to hear of it. \* \* \*

From your cavalier acquiescence in slandering a servant of the church and the slighting manner in which you treat the ministry of the Senate Chaplain in these days \* \* \* it would seem appropriate \* \* \* to change the name "The Christian Century" to "The Un-Christian Century."

FREDERICK BROWN HARRIS,  
Chaplain of the U.S. Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, those of us in politics are accustomed to smear attacks and unjustifiable criticisms in the American press. But it is a pretty sad thing when the press does not get its facts about a subject involving the Chaplain of the Senate prior to doing him great harm by the publication of such an untruthful story as he answered in his letter of September 26, 1962, to the Christian Century.

I have known many ministers of the Christian faith, but my association in the years that Chaplain Harris has been the Chaplain of the Senate justifies the evaluation of him that he practices the Christianity that he preaches.

#### REPRESENTATIVE CLEM MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like now to yield, without losing my right to the floor, to the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], who has a very, very sad report to make to the Senate. When he finishes, I shall make a comment of my own on the subject that he will discuss. Then I shall discuss another subject briefly. I yield to the Senator from California without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I very much appreciate the courtesy of my friend the senior Senator from Oregon yielding to me for the purpose of making a very sad announcement to the Senate.

Our colleague in the House, CLEM MILLER, was killed in an airplane accident which occurred yesterday at about 4:30 or 5 o'clock in the afternoon. The wreckage of the plane was found today some 15 miles east of Crescent City, where it had gone into a mountainside.

There were no survivors of the accident. The pilot, his son, and Representative MILLER were all killed.

CLEM MILLER, 46 years of age, was elected to the House of Representatives in 1958, reelected in 1960, and at this time was seeking his third term. He represented the district in California that runs from the Oregon line along the coast of California to just north of San Francisco. It is a great, beautiful, and wealthy district, primarily in lumber, livestock, agriculture, and recreation.

CLEM MILLER was a vigorous and intelligent spokesman for the people he represented. He took an intense interest in the affairs of his district. He was one of the most ardent conservationists in the House of Representatives. He was chiefly concerned, as the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has been, about the

problems of the lumber industry. He took an intense interest in the livestock, farming, and small business interests of his area. Only recently he was at the White House attending a ceremony at which the President of the United States signed the bill creating the Point Reyes National Seashore Park, of which CLEM MILLER was the author in the House of Representatives.

CLEM MILLER was born in Wilmington, Del. He served in the Army from 1940 to 1945. He is a graduate of Cornell. His presence in California was a loss to the area from which he had come and the great gains of our State. His death was a tragic loss to the Congress of the United States, the State of California, and our country, and certainly an even more tragic loss to his wife and to his five wonderful daughters. I am sad indeed that I must communicate this tragic news to the Senate at this time.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. I hardly know what to say. I join with my California colleague, all the Members of the Congress, and the people of my State in a profound and shocking sense of the loss of a distinguished Member of the legislative branch of the American Government. Over the last several years I have come to know the late Representative MILLER, not intimately, but on a very friendly basis.

Mr. President, CLEM MILLER was a member of the Democratic Party. That did not dissuade us from cooperating on many occasions. And to think that suddenly, and in the midst of life, with a lovely family, that untoward event in his home area of California would take him from this earth is a very sad thing to contemplate. On behalf of my wife and myself, I can do no more but to express the most sincere and heartfelt sentiments of condolence to Mrs. Miller and to all the family of our late colleague, who represented the First Congressional District of California. I thank my friend.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it was with great sadness that I heard of the death of CLEM MILLER. It was 3 weeks ago this past weekend that I traveled with him from San Francisco to Washington. Representative MILLER and I had been working, along with the Senator from California and the delegations from Oregon and Washington and Idaho, on the very serious lumber crisis confronting the Western States in respect to Canadian competition. On September 26, CLEM MILLER accompanied us to the White House for the conference with the President on the lumber problems. At the White House conference we divided up the work in the presentation of the issues to the President. One of the issues was given to Congressman MILLER. His brilliant and eloquent and forthright presentation of the facts supporting our position was highly commended subsequently by all in the delegation that I talked to about it. The best evidence I can give of the persuasiveness of Representative MILLER's presentation was that the issue that he

raised, dealing with the allowable-cut subject, was decided by the President then and there. When Representative MILLER finished, the President announced that it was his decision that the Forest Service should prepare, by October 15, a memorandum dealing with their record in connection with the allowable-cut problem and their proposals as to the future handling of the subject.

I agree with the two Senators from California that Congress has lost an able legislator, the State of California has lost one of its finest leaders, and the Nation has lost a good American.

#### PROPOSED CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BERLIN CRISIS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, earlier this afternoon I announced that before the day was over I intended to call up the concurrent resolution on the Berlin issue which the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and I submitted last week. The majority leader, as the Record will show, announced that he would have to follow a parliamentary course of action of postponing consideration of the resolution because it had been referred to the Foreign Relations Committee.

My reply to the majority leader was that the Senate knows its position with regard to the Berlin crisis. Referring the subject to the Foreign Relations Committee did not assure any action, because I had been advised by the staff of the Foreign Relations Committee that there probably was not a quorum of the Foreign Relations Committee in Washington today. I have subsequently checked on the matter, and it is true that there is not a quorum of the Foreign Relations Committee in Washington today. I also understand that at this hour the probabilities are very great that there is not a quorum of the Senate available, either.

Since my colloquy with the majority leader earlier today, I have conferred with the acting chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. He tells me that steps are being taken to endeavor to have a meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee on the resolution, and the prospects are reasonably good that a quorum of the committee can be obtained.

I take pride in my record of seeking to cooperate on parliamentary situations with the leadership of the Senate. I have stated this afternoon that I would await committee action until Wednesday. However, if there is no committee action on the resolution, I repeat what I said earlier this afternoon, that the American people are entitled to have the Senate act, committee or no committee.

Frankly, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I believe I can tell the Senate what will happen in the Foreign Relations Committee. The concurrent resolution will be read. The chairman will ask if there is any discussion. There may be a little bit, but not much. The subject involves something on which our minds have already been made up. There will not be a dissenting vote against the resolution in committee.



That is my prediction. The resolution is identical in its entire scope with the Cuban resolution. As the Presiding Officer knows, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, I was an ardent supporter of the final draft of the Cuban resolution. I believe we must adopt the Berlin resolution, just as we adopted the Cuban resolution, because, as was pointed out by the Senator from Minnesota, the Democratic whip [Mr. HUMPHREY] in his speech a few moments ago in the Senate, there is reason to believe that some time in November or December Mr. Khrushchev is likely to make a move in respect of the Berlin crisis.

It is of great importance that before we adjourn we adopt the concurrent resolution. The House has already done so. I know of no reason why there should be any delay in the Senate with respect to it. With all respect, let me say that I shall wait until Wednesday for action by the Committee on Foreign Relations. If the Foreign Relations Committee does not act on Wednesday, I hope the majority leader, when I make my motion to lay aside whatever pending business is before the Senate at the time—if it is necessary to make such a motion—to take up the Berlin concurrent resolution, he will give me his support. It is of the utmost importance that the Senate join with the House on a concurrent resolution on the Berlin crisis, and that Congress make clear to the world that we have no more intention of surrendering the precious rights of freedom with respect to Berlin than we do with respect to Cuba.

I sincerely hope that this will be the last time that the suggestion will have to be made on the floor of the Senate by any Senator that the time to act on such a resolution with respect to the Berlin crisis has arrived, and that the American people have the right to ask Congress to adopt that resolution prior to adjournment.

I say to my good friend the majority leader, who has just entered the Chamber, that I have been giving a review of my position with respect to a concurrent resolution on Berlin. I announced that I have conferred with the acting chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who has told me that steps are being taken to call up the concurrent resolution for action in the Committee on Foreign Relations on Wednesday morning, and that he has reasonable hope that a quorum will be present on Wednesday morning; that a quorum of the committee is not in Washington today. I said, good naturedly, that I am also suspicious that if an attempt were made to get a quorum of the Senate this afternoon in order to take up the concurrent resolution, probably there would be difficulty in getting a quorum if I carried forward with my announcement earlier this afternoon that I intended to bring it up.

I reported the position of the majority leader, namely, that he would be inclined to move to postpone the consideration of the concurrent resolution until the Committee on Foreign Relations had had an opportunity to act. I explained that I have tried to cooperate on parliamen-

tary questions, but that I believed that Wednesday would be the last opportunity for the Committee on Foreign Relations to take action this year; but if the Committee on Foreign Relations did not act by Wednesday, then I thought the Senate ought to act, committee action or no committee action. The House has already acted.

The majority whip has just finished a speech in which he set forth what many of us believe, namely, that Khrushchev will probably make some move with respect to Berlin in the latter part of November or December. Some of us believe that the Javits-Morse concurrent resolution should be adopted as giving notice not only to Khrushchev but also to the world that we have no more intention of compromising freedom in relation to Berlin than we do in relation to Cuba. The Javits-Morse concurrent resolution is identical in its scope and nature with the resolution on Cuba.

The senior Senator from Oregon believes that prior to adjournment the Senate should join with the House in a statement with respect to the Berlin crisis. I shall wait until Wednesday for further action on the resolution, in the hope that the Committee on Foreign Relations will act. But in case the committee does not, I shall feel it my clear duty to seek to have action taken on the concurrent resolution on Wednesday afternoon.

#### ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, October 8, 1962, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 914. An act to provide for more effective administration of public assistance in the District of Columbia, to make certain relatives responsible for support of needy persons, and for other purposes;

S. 1288. An act to amend section 362(b) of the Communications Act of 1934;

S. 1552. An act to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to assure the safety, effectiveness, and reliability of drugs, authorize standardization of drug names, and clarify and strengthen existing inspection authority; and for other purposes;

S. 1563. An act to authorize the conveyance of certain lands within the Clark Hill Reservoir, Savannah River, Georgia-South Carolina, to the Georgia-Carolina Council, Inc., Boy Scouts of America, for recreation and camping purposes;

S. 1658. An act to amend the act of January 2, 1951, prohibiting the transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce;

S. 2454. An act to amend the Housing Amendments of 1955 to make Indian Tribes eligible for Federal loans to finance public works or facilities, and for other purposes;

S. 2928. An act for the relief of Seymour K. Owens;

S. 3631. An act to amend title 13, United States Code, to preserve the confidential nature of copies of reports filed with the Bureau of the Census on a confidential basis;

S. 3679. An act authorizing an appropriation to enable the United States to extend an invitation to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations to hold a World Food Congress in the United States in 1963; and

S.J. Res. 235. Joint resolution to extend the time during which loans for mass transportation facilities may be made under title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to be transacted, I move that the Senate adjourn, under the order previously entered, until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 9, 1962, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 8, 1962:

##### U.S. MARSHAL

Ray H. Hemenway of Minnesota to be U.S. marshal for the district of Minnesota for the term of 4 years, vice Harry A. Sieben, resigned.

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

##### IN THE ARMY

Maj. Gen. Harvey Herman Fischer, O18832, U.S. Army, in the rank of lieutenant general.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, OCTOBER 8, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

*Psalm 35: 5: Commit thy way unto the Lord; trust also in Him; and He shall bring it to pass.*

Eternal God, our Father, who art always surrounding us with Thy divine providence, make us more responsive to the overtures of Thy love and grace.

Grant that daily we may be strengthened in mind and heart as we face our duties and responsibilities, our trials and temptations, our fears and frustrations.

Inspire us to reach out and go forward with renewed confidence and hope for the triumph of the principles of truth and justice.

May we strive to elevate the moral and spiritual character and conduct of our beloved country and be partners with all who are seeking to build a nobler civilization of good will and brotherhood.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 12907) entitled "An act for the relief of Dr. Mehmet Vecihi Kalaycioglu," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of